



University of Nebraska at Omaha  
**DigitalCommons@UNO**

Publications Archives, 1963-2000

Center for Public Affairs Research

1989

# Metropolitan Technical Community College Survey of Current Students

James Johnson

*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives>

 Part of the [Demography, Population, and Ecology Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Johnson, James, "Metropolitan Technical Community College Survey of Current Students" (1989). *Publications Archives, 1963-2000*. 316.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cparpubarchives/316>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Public Affairs Research at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications Archives, 1963-2000 by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).



METROPOLITAN TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
SURVEY OF CURRENT STUDENTS

by

Dr. James Johnson  
Dr. Murray Frost

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES.....	11
I. RESPONDENTS.....	1
A. Student Characteristics by Campus.....	1
B. Student Objectives by Campus.....	4
C. Reasons for Attending Current Campus.....	4
D. Financial Aid by Campus.....	7
II. PROGRAM ENROLLMENT.....	7
A. Fort Omaha.....	7
B. South Omaha.....	10
C. Southwest Campus.....	11
D. Comparison of Programs Across Current and Preferred Campuses.....	12
III. CAMPUS PREFERENCE.....	22
A. Campus Preferences.....	23
B. Campus Preference and Student Characteristics.....	23
C. The Future of Southwest Students.....	25
IV. EVALUATION.....	26
A. Willingness to Recommend.....	26
B. Instructional Rating.....	27
C. Evaluation by Program.....	29
V. NEEDS.....	32
A. New Program Interests by Campus.....	32
B. New Program Interests and Student Characteristics.....	34
C. New Program Interest and Current Programs.....	34
D. New Program Interest and Preferred Campus.....	38
E. Career Development and Job Placement Needs.....	40
F. Career Development and Job placement Needs by Program.....	40
VI. SUMMARY.....	44
APPENDIX.....	46

# LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS BY CAMPUS.....	2
2. REASON FOR CHOOSING CURRENT CAMPUS.....	5
3. DISTANCE FROM METRO TECH CAMPUS TO HOME.....	5
4. RECEIVING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ATTEND MTCC.....	5
5. PROGRAM ENROLLMENT BY CAMPUS.....	8
6. PROGRAM ENROLLMENT ACROSS CAMPUSES.....	13
7. PROGRAM ENROLLMENT ACROSS PREFERRED CAMPUSES.....	16
8. CURRENT AND PREFERRED CAMPUS LOCATION TYPOLOGY.....	18
9. CURRENT AND PREFERRED CAMPUS LOCATIONS BY PROGRAM.....	19
10. PROPORTIONS ATTENDING AND PREFERRING SOUTHWEST/ELKHORN LOCATIONS BY TYPOLOGY AND PROGRAM.....	20
11. PROPORTIONS ATTENDING AND PREFERRING FORT OMAHA AND SOUTH OMAHA LOCATIONS BY TYPOLOGY AND PROGRAM.....	21
12. 1980-81 CAMPUS PREFERENCE BY CURRENT CAMPUS.....	24
13. 1980-81 PLANS OF SOUTHWEST CAMPUS STUDENTS.....	24
14. RECOMMENDATION AND RATING OF INSTRUCTION BY CAMPUS.....	24
15. WILLINGNESS TO RECOMMEND AND INSTRUCTIONAL RATING BY STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS.....	28
16. PERCENT RECOMMENDING METRO TECH AND PERCENT RATING INSTRUCTION HIGH BY PROGRAM.....	30
17. NEW PROGRAM INTERESTS BY CAMPUS.....	33
18. NEW PROGRAM INTEREST ACROSS CAMPUS.....	35
19. NEW PROGRAM INTEREST BY SEX.....	36
20. NEW PROGRAM INTEREST BY FULL- AND PART-TIME STUDENTS AND BY DAY AND NIGHT STUDENTS.....	37

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
21. NEW COURSE INTEREST ACROSS PREFERRED CAMPUS.....	39
22. STUDENTS DESIRING CAREER DEVELOPMENT OR JOB PLACEMENT SERVICE BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS.....	41
23. CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND JOB PLACEMENT NEEDS BY PROGRAM.....	42

METROPOLITAN TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
SURVEY OF CURRENT STUDENTS

I. Respondents

A total of 1,957 students at the three main campuses and at off-campus centers completed the questionnaire. The Southwest campus accounted for 39% of the cases followed by South Omaha (36%) and Fort Omaha (24%). The remainder (2%) were at off-campus centers.

Most of these students (41%) were in their second or third quarter at Metropolitan Technical Community College. About one-fourth were in their first quarter while 20% were in their fourth through sixth quarters at the College. Thirteen percent (13%) were in a quarter beyond the sixth. See Table 1.

A majority (57%) were part-time students while 43% were full time. They were quite evenly split between day and night students (51% and 49%, respectively).

Somewhat more than half (54%) of the respondents were males, 46% females. Of those who reported their race (34 students did not), 83% were Caucasians, and 10% were Blacks, with very few in the remaining minority categories: Hispanic, 2.6%; Asian, 1.8%; and American Indian, 1%.

The age distribution of these students was fairly even with around one-fifth in each of the first four age groups: 18-20, 21%; 21-24, 21%; 25-29, 20%; 30-39, 23%. The students were essentially under 40. Only 15% were in the 40 and over age group. Most students (54%) were unmarried.

The vast majority (81%) were financially independent of their parents (reflecting, probably, the 80% of the group who were over 20 years old). The income distribution showed 30% with incomes below \$9,000 and one-quarter with incomes in excess of \$20,000. These were the two largest categories. About 15% had incomes between \$9,000 and \$12,000, 14% between \$12,000 and \$15,000, and 15% between \$15,000 and \$20,000. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of these students had no outside employment while 49% were employed over 35 hours per week. For the rest, 4% worked less than 10 hours, 8% worked 10-19 hours, and 11% worked between 20 and 34 hours each week.

A. Student Characteristics by Campus

The profile of the students described above can be further clarified by comparing the campuses. For most characteristics a pattern could be observed distinguishing the Fort Omaha campus from the other two.

TABLE 1  
CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS BY CAMPUS

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Southwest		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Quarters of Enrollment</u>								
1st	114	25	164	24	209	28	487	26
2nd - 3rd	204	44	283	41	291	39	778	41
4th - 6th	87	19	159	23	139	19	385	20
7th +	54	12	87	13	102	14	243	13
<u>Attendance</u>								
Full time	276	61	284	41	283	38	843	44
Part time	178	39	410	59	465	62	1,053	56
<u>Program Type</u>								
Associate degree	285	62	422	61	422	60	1,129	60
Certificate	108	24	122	18	112	15	342	18
Selected	65	14	149	22	187	25	401	21
<u>Day/Night</u>								
Day	329	72	296	43	335	45	960	51
Night	128	28	397	57	409	55	934	49
<u>Age</u>								
18-20	113	25	142	20	146	20	401	21
21-24	95	21	140	20	164	22	399	21
25-29	103	23	118	17	154	21	275	20
30-39	94	21	161	23	179	24	434	23
40+	50	11	134	19	98	13	282	15
<u>Income</u>								
< \$9,000	187	43	194	29	179	25	560	31
\$9,000-11,999	76	18	103	16	88	12	267	15
\$12,000-\$14,999	61	14	87	13	95	13	243	13
\$15,000-\$19,999	47	11	109	16	116	16	272	15
\$20,000 +	61	14	172	26	234	33	467	26
<u>Employment</u>								
Not employed	160	35	178	26	182	25	520	28
Employed less than 10 hrs/wk	21	5	25	4	22	3	68	4
10-19 hours	46	10	54	8	57	8	157	8
20-34 hours	57	13	78	11	79	11	214	11
35 hours or more	170	37	358	52	396	54	924	49
<u>Main Objective</u>								
First career	135	30	149	22	180	24	464	25
Changing career	143	31	207	30	274	37	624	33
Upgrade job skill	82	18	185	27	171	23	438	23
Personal interest	73	16	119	17	86	12	278	15
Other	22	5	26	4	27	4	75	4

That pattern, however, did not appear in the distribution of students in terms of number of quarters at Metro Tech. All three campuses showed the bulk of their students to be in their second or third quarter of school. Still, the South Omaha campus had somewhat more students beyond the third quarter while the Southwest campus had slightly more first quarter students.

The distribution of full- and part-time students did show a difference. While around 60% of the South Omaha and Southwest students were part time, about 60% of Fort Omaha students were full time.

The differences between Fort Omaha and the other campuses was further displayed in the distribution of degree programs being pursued by the students at different campuses. The Fort Omaha students were more likely than those at the other campuses to be in an associate degree or certificate program. The Southwest and South Omaha campuses had significantly more students taking selected courses.

The campus difference continued in comparing day and night enrollments. While more than two-thirds (72%) of the Fort Omaha students were primarily day students, more than one-half of the students at the other two campuses were primarily night students (55%-57%).

In regard to social and economic characteristics, no important difference was found in the sex distribution (about 55% were male at each campus), or in terms of financial dependency (more than 80% on each campus were independent of parents). However, a cross-campus difference was found in regard to race. Reflecting its proximity to Omaha's predominantly Black near north side, 29% of Fort Omaha campus respondents were Blacks. While the South Omaha and Southwest campuses were around 90% White (88% and 93%, respectively), only 65% of Fort Omaha students were of this race. The other racial/ethnic categories were very small so that only small differences were possible. Yet the Fort Omaha campus had the most minority students, 35% (29% Black, 3% Hispanic, 3% other minorities). South Omaha was 12% minority (5% Black, 4% Hispanic, 3% other minorities) while the Southwest campus had only 7% minorities (3% Black, 4% other minorities).

The age distribution of students showed a varied pattern among campuses. The Fort Omaha campus had slightly more younger and fewer older students. The South Omaha campus showed fewer in the 25-29 and more in the 40 and over age groups.

In the areas of income and employment campus differences were again apparent. Reflecting the economy of their general neighborhoods, the Fort Omaha students were more likely to be in the lowest economic group and to be unemployed than



were students at the other campuses. In contrast, Southwest campus students were more likely to have incomes in excess of \$20,000 and were slightly more likely than South Omaha students to be employed full time.

#### B. Student Objectives by Campus

One of the survey questions asked students to indicate their main objective in attending Metro Tech from among a series of job and non-job related choices. For all campuses an emphasis was found on new skills. For Fort Omaha and Southwest students, three-fifths (61%) indicated an objective headed toward a new career. About half (52%) of the South Omaha students indicated a similar objective.

Within this general pattern some cross-campus comparisons of interest could be made. The pattern shown earlier indicating Fort Omaha students to be younger, poorer, less fully employed, and more likely to be enrolled in a degree or certificate program showed up in these responses. Fort Omaha students, too, were more likely than those at other campuses to have preparation for a first career or job as their main objective. Southwest students were more likely than others to be looking to change a career or job, while South Omaha students were more likely than others to be upgrading an existing job skill. Interestingly, while fewer Southwest students were enrolled in a degree or certificate program (more were taking selected courses), fewer of them indicated satisfying a personal interest as their main objective at M.T.C.C.

#### C. Reasons for Attending Current Campus

Students were asked why they attended the campus at which they were currently enrolled. Table 2 shows that among all students convenience of the campus was the primary reason. Over half (56%) chose this reason. The second most frequently selected reason was that the program was only offered at their present campus. Presumably if another more convenient campus had their program, they would attend there. Atmosphere at the campus was the third most popular among the specified reasons. Few chose a campus because of friends. A sizable number (11%) chose their campus for an unspecified reason.

When one looks at the individual campus responses, a similar pattern is visible. Still, some differences may be important. For example, fully one-third (33%) of the Southwest campus students attended there because their program was only available there. Fort Omaha was also affected somewhat by this; a quarter (25%) of its students were there because of program necessity.

TABLE 2  
REASON FOR CHOOSING CURRENT CAMPUS

	Program Only Offered Here		Convenience		Atmosphere		Friends		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fort Omaha	113	25	262	58	26	6	5	1	47	10
South Omaha	141	20	437	63	28	4	11	2	74	11
Southwest	246	33	352	47	55	7	6	1	83	11
Total	500	27	1,051	56	109	6	22	1	204	11

TABLE 3  
DISTANCE FROM METRO TECH CAMPUS TO HOME

	Less Than 2 Miles		2-4 Miles		5-9 Miles		10-14 Miles		15+ Miles	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fort Omaha	85	19	149	33	120	26	49	11	53	12
South Omaha	121	17	160	23	238	34	87	13	90	13
Southwest	80	11	154	21	188	25	183	25	140	19

TABLE 4  
RECEIVING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO ATTEND MTCC

Campus	Total N %A*		From MTCC (e.g., BEOG, SEOG)			From Veterans			From Employer			From Other		
			N	%A*	%B**	N	%A*	%B**	N	%A*	%B**	N	%A*	%B**
Fort Omaha	272	61%	142	32%	52%	119	27%	44%	22	5%	8%	65	15%	24%
South Omaha	333	49%	109	16%	33%	191	28%	57%	50	7%	15%	50	7%	15%
Southwest	295	40%	93	13%	32%	166	22%	56%	72	10%	24%	53	7%	18%

\* % A = proportion of all students (Fort Omaha N = 448, South Omaha N = 683, Southwest N=739).

\*\* % B = proportion of students reporting receiving financial assistance.

The importance of convenience to campus choice is shown by the fact that 64% of the students went to Metro Tech from home and returned home directly from the College. Another 16% went to Metro Tech from work but from Metro to home. Eleven percent (11%) went from home to Metro Tech, and then to work and only 2% went from work to Metro Tech and back to work. The distance or accessibility from home to the campus was, then, apparently particularly important to almost two-thirds of the students and of some concern to virtually all of the rest.

For those students traveling to Metro Tech from home (79% of all students), most (42%) lived within 5 miles of their campus. Still, 30% lived more than 10 miles from their campus. About the same proportions were true for those who returned directly home from their Metro Tech classes. See Table 3.

For those who went to Metro Tech from work (19% of all students), 36% worked within 5 miles of their campus, but about 33% had to travel at least 10 miles from work to Metro Tech. For the 14% who went to work from Metro Tech, 38% were within 5 miles of work and 28% were more than 10 miles away.

By campus, Fort Omaha students were more likely than those at other campuses to go to Metro Tech from home (86% at Omaha compared to about 78% at the other campuses) and were somewhat less likely to go to home from Metro Tech (76% compared to about 83%). Still, for all campuses, home was both the beginning and end of most trips to Metro Tech.

A substantial difference occurred among the campuses in their patterns of distance between home and campus. Clearly, Fort Omaha students lived closer and Southwest students farther from their homes. More than one half (51%) of Fort Omaha students lived within 5 miles of campus; only 23% lived beyond 10 miles. In contrast, only 32% of Southwest students lived close to campus and 44% lived more than 10 miles away. Almost one-fifth (19%) lived more than 15 miles away. These proportions may be a function of differences in population density in the two campus areas, or they may reflect greater mobility by those living in the more affluent automobile-oriented Southwest area.

Similarly, many more Southwest students attended a campus far from their work (33% compared to 22% at the other campuses that had more than 10 miles from work to Metro). However, nearly equal proportions at each campus attended a campus close to their work (22%-24% were within 4 miles).

Assuming that distance is the primary ingredient of convenience, anything that affects this--moving a campus or a program--should affect the pattern of campus enrollment. Still, substantial numbers of students were willing to travel substantial distances to obtain desired instruction.

#### D. Financial Aid by Campus

The use of financial assistance by M.T.C.C. students reflected the socio-economic differences in the campuses. Students at the Fort Omaha campus were most dependent on financial aid, where 61% claimed to receive some kind of benefit. About 49% of South Omaha students received aid, while only 40% of Southwest campus students did. See Table 4.

A majority (52%) of Fort Omaha students who had financial assistance to attend Metro Tech received it from the College. In contrast, most students receiving aid at the other campuses received it in the form of veterans' benefits (57% of students at South Omaha and 56% at Southwest). Southwest students were more likely than those at the other campuses to be obtaining aid from employers--10% of all students and 24% of those students reporting any financial assistance.

### II. Program Enrollment

The students were asked if they were enrolled in a degree or certificate program and, if so, which. Answers were received from 1,379 students at three campuses. The distribution of students into these programs showed campus specializations and the comparative popularity of programs on the different campuses. The responses are presented here in several ways: by main category and by individual program, by each campus (showing the proportion of students at each campus in each program), and across campuses (showing how the program is dispersed between the campuses).

#### A. Fort Omaha

The Fort Omaha profile showed 362 students enrolled in 19 different programs.\* However, the 8 most popular programs accounted for 90% of Fort Omaha students. "Blue collar" trades, especially in the automotive and related areas accounted for the most students. Still, "white collar" programs in Business, Secretarial

---

\*Unfortunately, two similar questions on the survey instrument produced different answers. Question 5 read: "I am enrolled in: a) an associate degree program (2-year); b) a certificate program (1 year or less); c) neither (in selected courses only)." This question resulted in 1,512 students indicating they were enrolled in a degree or certificate program. Question 30 read: "I am enrolled in a degree or certificate program at Metropolitan Community College: a) yes; b) no." It resulted in 1,419 students indicating they were enrolled. Those who indicated they were not enrolled in a degree or certificate program were instructed to skip Question 31 which asked them to specify the program. Nevertheless, 1,569 students indicated a program. The analysis of current program enrollment by campus is based only on those students who indicated in Question 5 that they were degree or certificate students.

TABLE 5  
PROGRAM ENROLLMENT BY CAMPUS

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Southwest	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Agricultural Program</u>	2	.6	1	.2	8	1.6
Agricultural business management	1	.3	0	.0	2	.4
Agricultural chemicals technology	0	.0	1	.2	3	.6
Farm and ranch management	1	.3	0	.0	3	.6
<u>Air Conditioning Technology</u>	1	.3	2	.4	63	12.7
Associate	0	.0	2	.4	55	11.1
Certificate	1	.3	0	.0	8	1.6
<u>Apparel Arts</u>	0	.0	2	.4	5	1.0
Associate	0	.0	0	.0	4	.8
Certificate	0	.0	2	.4	1	.2
<u>Auto - Body Technology</u>	30	8.3	5	1.0	2	.4
Associate	26	7.2	4	.8	1	.2
Certificate	3	.8	0	.0	0	.0
Painting specialist	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0
Radiator repair specialist	0	.0	1	.2	0	.0
Upholstering and trim specialist	0	.0	0	.0	1	.2
<u>Automotive Mechanics</u>	59	16.3	130	25.6	3	.6
Mechanics	53	14.6	107	21.0	2	.4
Brake and alignment specialist	1	.3	8	1.6	0	.0
Engine rebuilding specialist	1	.3	6	1.2	1	.2
New and used vehicle preparation	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0
Service station mechanic and operator	2	.6	0	.0	0	.0
Sport and specialty engine mechanics	0	.0	1	.2	0	.0
Tune-up and A/C specialist	1	.3	8	1.6	0	.0
<u>Automotive Parts Technology</u>	2	.6	0	.0	0	.0
<u>Banking and Finance</u>	3	.8	0	.0	0	.0
<u>Business</u>	90	24.9	139	27.3	144	29.0
Accounting	24	6.6	50	9.8	31	6.3
Bookkeeping	16	4.4	11	2.2	10	2.0
Business management option	27	7.5	38	7.5	51	10.3
Computer programming	14	3.9	14	2.8	33	6.7
Merchandise management	4	1.1	3	.6	8	1.6
Real estate	2	.6	9	1.8	0	.9
Real estate management	1	.3	5	1.0	1	.2
Supervisory management	1	.3	9	1.8	9	1.8
Transportation and distribution mgmt.	1	.3	0	.0	1	.2
<u>Child Care</u>	31	8.6	0	.0	0	.0
Assistant teacher	8	2.2	0	.0	0	.0
Head teacher-director	12	3.3	0	.0	0	.0
Technician training	11	3.0	0	.0	0	.0
<u>Civil Engineering Technology</u>	0	.0	3	.6	16	3.2
Associate	0	.0	3	.6	16	3.2
<u>Commercial Art</u>	0	.0	3	.6	18	3.6
<u>Dental Assisting</u>	0	.0	25	4.9	3	.6

TABLE 5  
Continued

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Southwest	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Drafting Technology</u>	17	4.7	0	.0	25	5.0
Drafting and design	17	4.7	0	.0	25	5.0
Drafting	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
<u>Electronics Technology</u>	2	.6	64	12.6	4	.8
Associate	2	.6	62	12.2	4	.8
Certificate	0	.0	2	.4	0	.0
<u>Food Marketing and Distribution</u>	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0
<u>Graphic Arts (Printing)</u>	0	.0	1	.2	17	3.4
Associate	0	.0	1	.2	14	2.8
Certificate	0	.0	0	.0	3	.6
<u>Horticulture</u>	23	6.4	0	.0	0	.0
Floriculture	5	1.4	0	.0	0	.0
General horticulture	9	2.5	0	.0	0	.0
Landscape development	6	1.7	0	.0	0	.0
Nursery management	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0
Turfgrass and recreational grounds mgmt.	2	.6	0	.0	0	.0
<u>Hospitality</u>	21	5.8	1	.2	0	.0
Food service	1	.3	0	.0	0	.0
Food service management	6	1.7	0	.0	0	.0
Hotel/restaurant management	14	3.9	1	.2	0	.0
<u>Interior Design Assistant</u>	0	.0	0	.0	26	5.2
<u>Hearing Impaired Interpreter</u>	0	.0	10	2.0	5	1.0
<u>Key punch</u>	0	.0	0	.0	7	1.4
<u>Ophthalmic Technology</u>	0	.0	1	.2	11	2.2
Prescription technician	0	.0	0	.0	5	1.0
Technology	0	.0	1	.2	6	1.2
<u>Photography (Commercial)</u>	0	.0	0	.0	38	7.7
<u>Practical Nursing</u>	1	.3	2	.4	0	.0
<u>Private Security</u>	1	.3	38	7.5	0	.0
Private security	0	.0	3	.6	0	.0
Private security management	1	.3	35	6.9	0	.0
<u>Respiratory Therapy Technician</u>	0	.0	12	2.4	2	.4
<u>Secretarial Science</u>	31	8.6	50	9.8	35	7.1
Clerk typist	4	1.1	7	1.4	2	.4
Executive secretary	8	2.2	15	2.9	10	2.0
General office clerical	9	2.5	8	1.6	9	1.8
Legal secretary	7	1.9	14	2.8	7	1.4
Medical secretary	3	.8	6	1.2	7	1.4
<u>Surgical Technology</u>	4	1.1	1	.2	1	.2
<u>Welding and Fabrication Technology</u>	41	11.3	4	.8	62	12.5
Welding and fabrication	25	6.9	2	.4	44	8.9
Welding technology	16	4.4	2	.4	18	3.6
<u>Youth Services Specialist</u>	2	.6	15	2.9	1	.2

Science, and related areas also attracted many students. See Table 5.

Among all program areas the Business program was the most frequently mentioned; 25% of Fort Omaha students indicated a focus on this area. According to individual program responses, the Business Management option (7.5% of Fort Omaha students) and Accounting (6.6%) were the two largest categories within the Business Program with Bookkeeping (4.4%) and Computer Programming (3.9%) the other large categories. Merchandising, Real Estate Management, Supervisory Management, and Transportation and Distribution Management received a few mentions.

Automotive Mechanics was the next largest program at Fort Omaha, being mentioned by 16% of the students. Virtually all of these (90%) were in the Automotive Mechanics option in the overall program. The Welding Technology program was mentioned by 41 (11%) of these students; 61% of them (25 of the 41) were in Welding and Fabrication, and 39% (16) were in Welding Technology.

This was followed by the Child Care program with 31 students (or 9%). An equal number of students reported being in the Secretarial Science program with most of these students being in the areas of General Office Clerical, Executive Secretary, and Legal Secretary. The final program with as many as 30 students (8%) reporting was Automotive Body Technology. The majority of these (87% or 26 of 30) were in the Associate Degree program with all but one of the remainder in the certificate program.

Horticulture (23 students, 6%) and Hospitality (21 students, 6%) were the only other reasonably large categories. In Horticulture the sub-programs of General Horticulture, Landscape Development, and Floriculture accounted for most (20 of 23) of the students. In the Hospitality program, Hotel/Restaurant Management was the most popular option (14 of 21 students). The remaining programs were represented by no more than 4 Fort Omaha students.

#### B. South Omaha

On the South Omaha campus, the 509 respondents enrolled in degree or certificate programs mentioned 21 different programs. Of these, 6 programs accounted for about 88% of all students reporting, with two accounting for 53% of them.

As at the Fort Omaha campus, areas aligned with business and automotive specialties accounted for the most students, but "white collar" programs were somewhat more prevalent at the South Omaha campus.

The Business program received the most frequent mention on this campus. Over 27% of South Omaha degree and certificate students mentioned this major

area. Within Business, Accounting was most often mentioned; 50 students or about 36% of those mentioning Business options reported this interest. Other large sub-areas within the Business program at South Omaha were Business Management (38 students), Computer Programming (14 students), Bookkeeping (11 students), and Real Estate (9 students).

The second largest overall program was Automotive Mechanics with 130 students representing 26% of those enrolled in degree or certificate programs at South Omaha. Eighty-two percent (82% or 107) of these were in the general Automotive Mechanics program with Brake and Alignment Specialist (8 students), Tune-Up and Air Conditioning Specialist (8 students), and Engine Rebuilding Specialist (6 students) comprising virtually all of the remainder.

Electronics Technology, which had only a very small number of students at the other two campuses, was the third largest South Omaha program. Almost 13% of these students indicated this specialty with virtually all of them (62 of 64 or 97%) in the Associate Degree program.

Secretarial Science (50 students, 10%), Private Security (38 students, 7%) and Dental Assisting (25 students, 5%) were the remaining well represented programs. Those in Secretarial Science area were in all five sub-programs. Executive Secretary (15 students) and Legal Secretary (14 students) were mentioned most, followed by General Office Clerical (8 students), Clerk Typist (7 students), and Medical Secretary (6 students).

#### C. Southwest Campus

On the Southwest campus 496 students reported enrollment in degree programs in 22 different areas. About 83% of students were in the 8 most mentioned programs. The students here were more concentrated into "white collar" programs with only 2 "blue collar" programs--Welding Technology and Air Conditioning, Refrigeration and Heating Technology--showing reasonably large numbers.

As as the other campuses, Business was the largest major category with 144 (29%) of the students. About 35% (51 students) of those in this area were in the Business Management program. Computer Programming and Accounting were the specializations of 33 and 31 of the students, respectively. Bookkeeping (10 students), Supervisory Management (9 students), and Merchandising Management (8 students) accounted for all but two of the remaining students in this area.

The second most frequently mentioned program at the Southwest campus was Air Conditioning, Refrigeration, and Heating Technology. Of the 63 students (13% of all Southwest degree respondents) mentioning this program, 87% (55 students) were in the Associate Degree program. Welding Technology was indicated



by 62 students (13% of those reporting). About 71% of these were in Welding and Fabrication Technology with 29% in the Welding Technology sub-program.

Photography (38 students, 8%) and Secretarial Science (35 students, 7%) were the next largest programs. The Secretarial Science students were dispersed among the five sub-headings in the following order: Executive Secretary (10 students), General Office Clerical (9), Legal Secretary (7), Medical Secretary (7), and Clerk Typist (2).

While the above accounted for the larger Southwest programs, several other programs should be noted. Interior Design had 26 students (5%), Drafting Technology had 25 students (5%), Commercial Art had 18 students (4%), Graphic Arts had 17 students (3%), and Civil Engineering had 16 students (3%). In all cases where there was a two-year or a one-year option, the preponderance of students mentioned the two-year program.

In summary, the Southwest campus had the most programs mentioned, the Fort Omaha campus the least. South Omaha students were most concentrated in the fewest programs. All three campuses showed one or two programs which accounted for a sizable proportion of degree students with a series of smaller programs accounting for the remainder.

#### D. Comparison of Programs Across Current and Preferred Campuses

Table 6, which shows the programs across campuses, indicates a program's current concentration or dispersion within the Metro Tech campus system.

Students were also asked which campus they would prefer to attend in 1980-81 if they could attend any of the campuses to be functioning then. This question is of special significance given the possibility of realigning programs in conjunction with the opening of the new Elkhorn Valley campus at 204th and Dodge and the closing of the Southwest campus at 132nd and I.

In general, according to student preferences, the Elkhorn Valley campus was not able to attract all of the current Southwest campus students, and the South Omaha campus attracted more student interest than the Fort Omaha campus. Since these preferences were expressed prior to any experience at the new campus and possibly without prior experience of the alternative campuses, whether they will be related to actual attendance or subsequent attitudes toward Metro Tech is not certain.

Approximately 60% of the students at the Southwest campus who answered this question indicated they would prefer their 1980-81 enrollment to be at the new Elkhorn Valley campus; 32% said they would prefer the South Omaha campus, and

TABLE 6

## PROGRAM ENROLLMENT ACROSS CAMPUSES

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Southwest		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<u>Agricultural Program</u>	2	18.0	1	9.0	8	73.0	11
Agricultural business management	1	33.3	0	.0	2	66.7	3
Agricultural chemicals technology	0	.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	4
Farm and ranch management	1	25.0	0	.0	3	75.0	4
<u>Air Conditioning Technology</u>	1	1.5	2	3.0	63	95.5	66
Associate	0	.0	2	3.5	55	96.5	57
Certificate	1	11.1	0	.0	8	88.9	9
<u>Apparel Arts</u>	0	.0	2	28.6	5	71.4	7
Associate	0	.0	0	.0	4	100.0	4
Certificate	0	.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	3
<u>Auto - Body Technology</u>	30	81.1	5	13.5	2	5.4	37
Associate	26	83.9	4	12.9	1	3.2	31
Certificate	3	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	3
Painting specialist	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
Radiator repair specialist	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0	1
Upholstering and trim specialist	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0	1
<u>Automotive Mechanics</u>	59	30.7	130	67.7	3	1.6	192
Mechanics	53	32.7	107	66.0	2	1.2	162
Brake and alignment specialist	1	11.1	8	88.9	0	.0	9
Engine rebuilding specialist	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5	8
New and used vehicle preparation	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
Service station mechanic and operator	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	2
Sport and specialty engine mechanics	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0	1
Tune-up and A/C specialist	1	11.1	8	88.9	0	.0	9
<u>Automotive Parts Technology</u>	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	2
<u>Banking and Finance</u>	3	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	3
<u>Business</u>	90	24.1	139	37.3	144	38.6	373
Accounting	24	22.9	50	47.8	31	29.5	105
Bookkeeping	16	43.2	11	29.7	10	27.0	37
Business management option	27	23.3	38	32.8	51	44.0	116
Computer programming	14	23.0	14	23.0	33	54.1	61
Merchandise management	4	26.7	3	20.0	8	53.3	15
Real estate	2	18.2	9	81.8	0	.0	11
Real estate management	1	14.3	5	71.4	1	14.3	7
Supervisory management	1	5.3	9	47.3	9	47.3	19
Transportation and distribution mgmt.	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0	2
<u>Child Care</u>	31	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	31
Assistant teacher	8	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	8
Head teacher-director	12	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	12
Technician training	11	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	11
<u>Civil Engineering Technology</u>	0	.0	3	15.8	16	84.2	19
Associate	0	.0	3	15.8	16	84.2	19
<u>Commercial Art</u>	0	.0	3	14.3	18	85.7	21
<u>Dental Assisting</u>	0	.0	25	89.3	3	10.7	28

TABLE 6

Continued

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Southwest		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<u>Drafting Technology</u>	17	40.5	0	.0	25	59.5	42
Drafting and design	17	40.5	0	.0	25	59.5	42
Drafting	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0
<u>Electronics Technology</u>	2	2.9	64	91.4	4	5.7	70
Associate	2	2.9	62	91.2	4	5.9	68
Certificate	0	.0	2	100.0	0	.0	2
<u>Food Marketing and Distribution</u>	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
<u>Graphic Arts (Printing)</u>	0	.0	1	5.9	17	94.1	18
Associate	0	.0	1	6.7	14	93.3	15
Certificate	0	.0	0	.0	3	100.0	3
<u>Horticulture</u>	23	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	23
Floriculture	5	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	5
General horticulture	9	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	9
Landscape development	6	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	6
Nursery management	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
Turfgrass and recreational grounds mgmt.	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	2
<u>Hospitality</u>	21	95.5	1	4.5	0	.0	22
Food service	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
Food service management	6	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	6
Hotel/restaurant management	14	93.3	1	6.7	0	.0	15
<u>Interior Design Assistant</u>	0	.0	0	.0	26	100.0	26
<u>Hearing Impaired Interpreter</u>	0	.0	10	66.7	5	33.3	15
<u>Keypunch</u>	0	.0	0	.0	7	100.0	7
<u>Ophthalmic Technology</u>	0	.0	1	8.3	11	91.7	12
Prescription technician	0	.0	0	.0	5	100.0	5
Technology	0	.0	1	14.3	6	85.7	7
<u>Photography (Commercial)</u>	0	.0	0	.0	38	100.0	38
<u>Practical Nursing</u>	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	.0	3
<u>Private Security</u>	1	2.6	38	97.4	0	.0	39
Private security	0	.0	3	100.0	0	.0	3
Private security management	1	2.7	35	97.2	0	.0	36
<u>Respiratory Therapy Technician</u>	0	.0	12	85.7	2	4.3	14
<u>Secretarial Science</u>	31	26.7	50	43.1	35	30.2	116
Clerk typist	4	30.8	7	53.8	2	15.4	13
Executive secretary	8	24.2	15	45.5	10	30.3	33
General office clerical	9	34.6	8	30.8	9	34.6	26
Legal secretary	7	25.0	14	50.0	7	25.0	28
Medical secretary	3	18.8	6	37.5	7	43.8	16
<u>Surgical Technology</u>	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	6
<u>Welding and Fabrication Technology</u>	41	38.3	4	3.7	62	57.9	107
Welding and fabrication	25	35.2	2	2.8	44	62.0	71
Welding technology	16	44.4	2	5.6	18	50.0	36
<u>Youth Services Specialist</u>	2	11.1	15	83.3	1	5.6	18

only 8% indicated the Fort Omaha campus. Students from the other two campuses expressed relatively higher rates of preferred attendance at their current campuses. Three-fourths (77%) of the Fort Omaha students would prefer to take their classes at that campus, while 87% of the South Omaha campus students preferred to remain there.

Preferred campus location, however, was not constant across all programs.\* Table 7 reports the preferred campus locations by current program. A comparison with Table 6 indicates several shifts from current attendance patterns. These are highlighted in Tables 8-11.

Programs were classified as predominantly at one campus, mutually shared by two campuses, or considerably shared by all three campuses. Operationally these were defined as follows:

- predominant - the campus with the highest enrollment in a program had at least twice the enrollment of the next highest campus.
- mutual - the campus with the highest enrollment in a program did not have at least twice the enrollment of the second highest campus but the second highest campus had at least twice the enrollment of the lowest campus.
- considerable - none of the above.

Using these operational definitions for programs with at least 10 respondents, 19 of the 23 programs were predominantly at one campus; 8 of these were at Southwest, 7 at South Omaha, and 4 at Fort Omaha. Two programs were mutually shared by the Southwest and Fort Omaha campuses, and 2 programs were considerably shared by all three campuses.

When students were given the opportunity to indicate their preferred campus location, greater decentralization was evident. For preferred locations, only 11 programs were classified as predominantly at one campus, 9 programs met the operational definition of mutually shared by two campuses (6 by Elkhorn and South Omaha, 1 by Elkhorn and Fort Omaha, and 2 by Fort Omaha and South Omaha), and 3 programs were considerably shared by the three campuses. See Table 6.

Table 9 shows the current and preferred campus locations for each program. Table 10 indicates the proportions for Southwest/Elkhorn. These tables indicate that of the 8 programs predominantly at Southwest only 2--Commercial Art and Ophthalmics--continued in the same category, and even these had declines between current and preferred enrollment of 24 and 30 percentage points, respectively. For each of these two programs, 62% of the students preferred the new Elkhorn Valley

---

\*In order to provide campus preferences by program for as many students as possible, this analysis is based on all students indicating their programs on Question 31 regardless of how they answered Questions 5 or 30.

TABLE 7

## PROGRAM ENROLLMENT ACROSS PREFERRED CAMPUS

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Elkhorn		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
<u>Agricultural Program</u>	2	15.4	4	30.8	7	53.8	13
Agricultural business management	1	33.3	0	.0	2	60.7	3
Agricultural chemicals technology	0	.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	4
Farm and ranch management	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	6
<u>Air Conditioning Technology</u>	8	11.9	32	47.8	27	40.3	67
Associate	5	8.6	27	64.6	26	44.8	58
Certificate	3	33.3	5	55.5	1	11.1	9
<u>Apparel Arts</u>	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5	8
Associate	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0	5
Certificate	0	.0	3	100.0	0	.0	3
<u>Auto - Body Technology</u>	21	53.8	15	38.5	3	9.7	39
Associate	17	53.2	12	37.5	3	9.4	32
Certificate	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	.0	3
Painting specialist	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
Radiator repair specialist	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0	1
Upholstering and trim specialist	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	2
<u>Automotive Mechanics</u>	55	26.8	135	65.8	15	7.3	205
Mechanics	49	28.3	111	64.2	13	7.5	173
Brake and alignment specialist	2	22.2	7	77.8	0	.0	9
Engine rebuilding specialist	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5	8
New and used vehicle preparation	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
Service station mechanic and operator	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	2
Sport and specialty engine mechanics	0	.0	2	66.7	1	33.3	3
Tune-up and A/C specialist	0	.0	9	100.0	0	.0	9
<u>Automotive Parts Technology</u>	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	2
<u>Banking and Finance</u>	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	.0	3
<u>Business</u>	90	21.7	189	45.5	136	32.8	415
Accounting	29	26.1	56	50.5	25	22.5	110
Bookkeeping	18	41.9	14	32.6	11	25.6	43
Business management option	24	18.6	56	43.4	49	38.0	129
Computer programming	11	17.7	28	45.2	23	37.1	62
Merchandise management	3	17.6	7	41.2	7	41.2	17
Real estate	2	9.1	13	59.1	7	31.8	22
Real estate management	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5	8
Retailing	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0	1
Supervisory management	1	4.8	9	42.9	11	52.5	21
Transportation and distribution mgmt.	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0	2
<u>Child Care</u>	22	64.7	6	17.6	6	17.6	34
Assistant teacher	4	50.0	3	37.5	1	12.5	8
Head teacher-director	8	72.1	2	14.3	4	28.6	14
Technician training	10	83.3	1	8.3	1	8.3	12
<u>Civil Engineering Technology</u>	3	15.0	6	30.0	11	55.0	20
Associate	3	15.0	6	30.0	11	55.0	20
<u>Commercial Art</u>	6	23.1	4	15.4	16	61.5	26
<u>Dental Assisting</u>	4	13.8	20	69.0	5	17.2	29

TABLE 7  
Continued

	Fort Omaha No.	%	South Omaha No.	%	Elkhorn No.	%	Total
<u>Drafting Technology</u>	17	39.5	6	19.0	20	46.5	43
Drafting and design	17	40.5	6	14.3	19	45.2	42
Drafting	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0	1
<u>Electronics Technology</u>	4	5.6	59	81.9	9	12.5	72
Associate	4	5.8	56	81.2	9	13.0	69
Certificate	0	.0	3	100.0	0	.0	3
<u>Food Marketing and Distribution</u>	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0	1
<u>Graphic Arts (Printing)</u>	3	15.0	8	40.0	9	45.0	20
Associate	3	18.8	6	37.5	7	43.8	16
Certificate	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	4
<u>Horticulture</u>	16	64.0	5	20.0	4	16.0	25
Floriculture	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0	5
General horticulture	7	63.6	2	18.2	2	18.2	11
Landscape development	5	87.3	1	16.7	0	.0	6
Nursery management	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
Turfgrass and recreational grounds mgmt.	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0	2
<u>Hospitality</u>	13	59.1	5	22.7	4	18.2	22
Food service	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	1
Food service management	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	6
Hotel/restaurant management	8	53.3	4	26.7	3	20.0	15
<u>Interior Design Assistant</u>	1	6.9	13	44.8	14	48.3	28
<u>Hearing Impaired Interpreter</u>	0	.0	15	78.9	4	21.1	19
<u>Key punch</u>	2	18.2	4	36.4	5	45.5	11
<u>Ophthalmic Technology</u>	2	15.9	3	23.7	8	61.5	13
Prescription technician	1	16.7	1	16.7	4	66.7	6
Technology	1	14.3	2	28.6	4	57.1	7
<u>Photography (Commercial)</u>	6	15.0	12	30.0	22	55.0	40
<u>Practical Nursing</u>	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	.0	3
<u>Private Security</u>	1	1.9	47	87.0	6	11.1	54
Private security	0	.0	3	100.0	0	.0	3
Private security management	1	2.0	44	86.3	6	11.7	51
<u>Respiratory Therapy Technician</u>	3	21.4	10	71.5	1	7.1	14
<u>Secretarial Science</u>	34	20.5	74	44.6	58	34.9	166
Clerk typist	5	20.0	8	32.0	12	48.0	25
Executive secretary	10	25.0	16	40.0	14	35.0	40
General office clerical	8	14.8	27	50.0	19	35.2	54
Legal secretary	8	25.8	17	54.8	6	19.4	31
Medical secretary	3	18.8	6	37.5	7	43.8	16
<u>Surgical Technology</u>	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	6
<u>Welding and Fabrication Technology</u>	38	33.3	45	39.5	31	27.2	114
Welding and fabrication	26	33.8	29	37.7	22	28.6	77
Welding technology	12	32.4	16	43.2	9	24.3	37
<u>Youth Services Specialist</u>	6	33.3	11	61.1	1	5.6	18

TABLE 8  
CURRENT AND PREFERRED CAMPUS LOCATION TYPOLOGY

	Current	Preferred
Predominantly: Southwest/Elkhorn (SW/E)	8	2
: Fort Omaha (FO)	4	3
: South Omaha (SO)	7	6
Mutually Shared: SW/E - FO	2	1
: SW/E - SO	-	6
: FO - SO	-	2
Considerably Shared: SW/E - FO - SO	2	3
TOTAL	23	23

TABLE 9

## CURRENT AND PREFERRED CAMPUS LOCATIONS BY PROGRAM

Program	Current							Preferred								
	Predominantly			Mutually Shared By			Considerably Shared	Predominantly			Mutually Shared By			Considerably Shared		
	SW	FO	SO	SW	FO	SO	SW – FO – SO	EV	FO	SO	EV	FO	SO	EV	FO	SO
Agriculture	x										x			x		
Air Conditioning	x										x			x		
Auto Body Technology		x										x		x		
Auto Mechanics			x							x						
Business							x									x
Child Care		x							x							
Civil Engineering Technology	x										x			x		
Commercial Art	x							x								
Dental Assisting			x							x						
Drafting				x	x						x	x				
Electronics			x							x						
Graphic Arts	x										x			x		
Hearing Impaired Interpreter			x							x						
Horticulture		x							x							
Hospitality		x							x							
Interior Design	x										x			x		
Ophthalmics	x							x								
Photography	x										x			x		
Private Security			x							x						
Respiratory Therapy			x							x						
Secretarial Science							x									x
Welding				x	x											x
Youth Services			x									x		x		
TOTALS	8	4	7	2	2		2	2	3	6	7	3	8			3



TABLE 10  
PROPORTIONS ATTENDING AND PREFERRING SOUTHWEST/ELKHORN  
LOCATIONS BY TYPOLOGY AND PROGRAM

	N	Current at Southwest	N	Preferred at Elkhorn	Percentage Point Shift
<u>Programs Predominantly at Southwest</u>					
Agriculture	11	73%	13	54%	-19
Air Conditioning	66	96%	67	40%	-56
Civil Engineering Technology	19	84%	20	55%	-29
Commercial Art	21	86%	26	62%	-24
Graphic Arts	18	94%	20	45%	-49
Interior Design	26	100%	28	48%	-52
Ophthalmics	12	92%	13	62%	-30
Photography	38	100%	40	55%	-45
<u>Programs Mutually Shared by Southwest</u>					
Drafting	42	60%	43	47%	-13
Welding	107	58%	114	27%	-31
<u>Programs Considerably Shared by Southwest</u>					
Business	373	39%	415	33%	-6
Secretarial Science	116	30%	166	35%	+5
<u>Programs Minimally Shared by Southwest</u>					
Auto Body Technology	37	5%	39	10%	+5
Auto Mechanics	192	2%	205	7%	+5
Child Care	31	0	34	18%	+18
Dental Assisting	28	11%	29	17%	+6
Electronics	70	6%	72	13%	+7
Horticulture	23	0	25	16%	+16
Hospitality	22	0	22	18%	+18
Hearing Impaired Interpreter	15	33%	19	21%	-12
Private Security	39	0	54	11%	+11
Respiratory Therapy	14	4%	14	7%	+3
Youth Services	18	6%	18	6%	0
<u>Programs &lt; 10 Students, But Predominantly at Southwest</u>					
Apparel Arts	7	71%	8	13%	-58
Keypunch	7	100%	11	45%	-55

TABLE 11  
PROPORTIONS ATTENDING AND PREFERRING FORT OMAHA  
AND SOUTH OMAHA LOCATIONS BY TYPOLOGY AND PROGRAM

	N	Current at Fort Omaha	N	Preferred at Fort Omaha	Percentage Point Shift
<b>A. FORT OMAHA</b>					
<u>Programs Predominantly at Fort Omaha</u>					
Auto Body Technology	37	81%	39	54%	-27
Child Care	31	100%	34	65%	-35
Horticulture	23	100%	25	64%	-36
Hospitality	22	95%	22	59%	-36
<u>Programs Mutually Shared by Fort Omaha</u>					
Drafting	42	40%	43	38%	-2
Welding	107	38%	114	33%	-5
<u>Programs Considerably Shared by Fort Omaha</u>					
Business	373	24%	415	22%	-2
Secretarial Science	116	27%	166	20%	-7
	N	Current at South Omaha	N	Preferred at South Omaha	Percentage Point Shift
<b>B. SOUTH OMAHA</b>					
<u>Programs Predominantly at South Omaha</u>					
Auto Mechanics	192	68%	205	66%	-2
Dental Assisting	28	89%	29	69%	-20
Electronics Technology	70	91%	72	82%	-9
Hearing Impaired Interpreter	15	67%	19	79%	+12
Private Security	39	97%	54	87%	-10
Respiratory Therapy	14	86%	14	71%	-15
Youth Services	18	83%	18	61%	-22
<u>Programs Considerably Shared by South Omaha</u>					
Business	373	37%	415	46%	+9
Secretarial Science	116	43%	166	45%	+2

campus. The program currently offered predominantly at Southwest which showed the most decline from actual to preferred location (56 percentage points) was Air Conditioning, which declined from 96% to only 40% of the students preferring to transfer to Elkhorn Valley. This 40% proportion was also the lowest of these programs.

Of the two programs mutually shared by the Southwest and Fort Omaha campuses, one (Drafting) continued as a mutually shared program according to preferences, but the other (Welding) became a considerably shared program.

The two programs shared by the Southwest campus with the other two campuses remained in that category, showing the least change between current and preferred location (Business declined only 6 percentage points, and Secretarial Science actually increased 5 percentage points from 30% current enrollment to 35% preferred).

Programs which had minimal participation from students enrolled at Southwest generally showed an increase in preferred enrollment for the new Elkhorn Valley campus. For example, currently 3% of the Child Care program students indicated they were attending the Southwest campus, but 18% of them preferred to enroll at Elkhorn Valley.

Programs predominantly at Fort Omaha also showed a relatively large decline in the proportion preferring to attend there, but only one program (Auto Body Technology) shifted categories. Declines ranged from 27 percentage points for Auto Body Technology (81% of their students attending Fort Omaha but only 54% preferring that campus) to 36 percentage point declines for the Horticulture and Hospitality programs.

Programs predominantly at South Omaha generally showed declines too (6 of the 7 programs) but these were generally smaller.

These analytical summaries have highlighted the broad program areas, but attention should be given to the various options within these programs as the patterns for some individual options were different. For example, although the broader Business category was designated as a considerably shared program, the Computer Programming option was predominantly at the Southwest campus (with 54% of the enrollment); student preferences placed it into the mutually shared category, whereas all Business programs remained in the considerably shared category.

### III. Campus Preference

The students were asked which campus they would prefer to attend in 1980-81 assuming their courses were available. These responses were analyzed above in

regard to their current program enrollments. Here this will be analyzed in terms of other needs. While these preferences do not fully predict campus enrollments for the coming year, they are suggestive of potential markets.

#### A. Campus Preferences

Not surprisingly, a vast majority (over 70%) preferred to attend their present campus or equivalent. However, this was much less pronounced for the Southwest campus which will relocate. While 77% and 87% of the Fort Omaha and South Omaha students preferred to stay at the same campus, only 60% of the Southwest campus students preferred to relocate to the Elkhorn campus. Preference may not be tantamount to actual behavior as the analysis below of where Southwest students expect to be next year will show. See Table 12.

If students could fully act upon their preferences, little change would take place in total enrollment at the Fort Omaha campus. It would continue to serve around 23% of all Metro Tech students. The big shift would be at South Omaha where student enrollment would jump from somewhat over one-third of all students to almost one-half of them. Of course, this increase would come from Southwest students transferring to South Omaha rather than to Elkhorn. Almost one-third of current Southwest students would transfer to South Omaha if they could. Based on preference alone, Elkhorn would serve about 28% of all Metro Tech students.

#### B. Campus Preference and Student Characteristics

Assuming students could act fully on their preferences, how would student populations differ from the present? In terms of the distribution of students by number of quarters attended the answer is, not much. While shifts in patterns would occur, few would be more than 3 percentage points different from existing percentages.

The full time/part time distribution would change some. Fort Omaha and South Omaha would lose some full-time students. In fact, Fort Omaha would shift from a majority of full time to a majority of part time. Elkhorn, however, would have a somewhat larger percentage of full-time students going from 38% (at Southwest) to 43%.

Parallel to the full/part time shift would come a shift in day/night student enrollments. Fort Omaha would remain mostly day students but less so than currently (72% dropping to 66%). The South Omaha campus would be largely unaffected while Elkhorn would improve its day student percentage from 45% (at Southwest) to 50%. The mix of degree and certificate students and those taking

TABLE 12  
1980-81 CAMPUS PREFERENCE BY CURRENT CAMPUS

Preferred Campus	Total *		Current Campus					
	No.	%	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Southwest	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fort Omaha	449	23	351	77	33	5	61	8
South Omaha	948	49	72	16	609	87	232	32
Elkhorn	531	28	34	7	54	8	441	60

\*Total includes all students preferring a campus location and is not limited to students listing their current campus as Fort Omaha, South Omaha, or Southwest.

TABLE 13  
1980-81 PLANS OF SOUTHWEST CAMPUS STUDENTS

Preferred Campus	1980-81 Plan											
	Program complete		Attend Elkhorn		Attend Fort Omaha		Attend South Omaha		Attend another school		Will not attend school	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fort Omaha	6	11	23	42	10	18	1	2	10	18	5	9
South Omaha	15	8	64	34	6	3	65	36	16	9	19	10
Elkhorn	32	8	320	77	5	1	8	2	30	7	22	5
TOTAL	53	8	407	62	21	3	76	12	56	8	46	7

TABLE 14  
RECOMMENDATION AND RATING OF INSTRUCTION BY CAMPUS

	Recommended Metro Tech		Excellent		Rating of Instruction				Poor	
	No.	%	No.	%	Good	Fair			No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Fort Omaha	354	77	128	28	253	55	70	15	6	1
South Omaha	548	79	226	33	369	53	91	13	8	1
Southwest	577	77	219	29	431	58	87	12	10	1
TOTAL	1,479	78	573	30	1,053	56	248	13	24	1

occasional courses would be unchanged with each campus remaining approximately 60% degree students and Fort Omaha continuing to have the least proportion of students not pursuing a degree or certificate (approximately 15%). Racial distributions would be only slightly changed with Blacks gravitating to the closer Fort Omaha campus and away from Elkhorn and American Indians favoring South Omaha (probably closer to their homes). Changes in the age distribution, too, would be minor with Fort Omaha losing a few and Elkhorn gaining a few younger students (about 3 percentage points in each case). The proportions on each campus receiving financial assistance would be unchanged with the new Elkhorn Valley campus having approximately 41% of its students receiving aid, compared to proportions of approximately 48% at South Omaha and 59% at Fort Omaha. Finally, the distribution by educational objective would remain largely unchanged with no more than 2 percentage points difference from present to preferred campus.

The biggest difference, then, in the change of campus location would be on the number preferring each campus. Even then only South Omaha and Elkhorn would be affected. In terms of the student mix, the new student compositions would be almost indistinguishable from the present ones.

#### C. The Future of Southwest Students

What effect will the transfer of the Southwest campus to Elkhorn have on presently enrolled Southwest campus students? This is a vital question since such a large proportion of Metro Tech students attend the Southwest campus.

Southwest students were asked what their future plans are as well as their campus preference. Their replies are reflected in Table 13.

As can be seen, preferences do not equal projected behavior. While many did not prefer the Elkhorn campus, most who were going to Metro Tech or to school at all will attend at Elkhorn. Forty-two percent (42%) of those who preferred Fort Omaha and 34% of those who preferred South Omaha will, nonetheless, attend Elkhorn. Fully three-fifths (62%) of all Southwest students answering both questions will attend Elkhorn.

This figure, in itself, is misleadingly low as it is based on all students, including those who will not attend any school next year. There is no reason to believe that the transfer of campuses led to any of the decisions to leave school.

When only the responses of the 560 students who did intend to continue in school were considered, the breakdown is as follows: 73% to Elkhorn, 4% to Fort Omaha, 14% to South Omaha, and 10% to another school. Significantly, fully 90% of those who expected to continue in school will do so at some Metro

Tech campus, most frequently Elkhorn. That 10% will attend a school other than Metro can hardly be attributed to the campus move. Many Southwest campus students are accustomed to driving relatively long distances to attend that campus, as previously noted. More likely, these students are changing schools because of instructional goals and might have left Metro Tech regardless of the campus move. When only those Southwest students who would probably have continued at Metro Tech regardless of the campus move were considered, 81% intended to transfer to Elkhorn, 15% to South Omaha, and 4% to Fort Omaha.

To what degree the decision to attend at Elkhorn is affected by program availability is unknown. However, more Southwest students indicated that they chose that campus because of program availability than did the students at the other campuses. Presumably if their programs were more available elsewhere there might be a greater move to attend at the preferred campus. The desire to maximize use of the new campus and the desire to serve the preferences of the students may be at cross-purposes.

#### IV. Evaluation

To assess how well Metro Tech is serving its students, current students were asked if they had recommended Metro Tech to another person and how they rated the quality of instruction at Metro Tech. The responses are analyzed here.

As Table 14 shows, the rating of Metro Tech was quite high on each campus and for all three combined. Seventy-eight percent (78%) of these students reported having recommended Metro Tech to another. Just how high this was cannot be discerned without some comparison: e.g., responses to a similar question at another college. Still, that nearly four-fifths of all students report having made a recommendation appears substantial on its face.

Similarly, evaluations of instruction were high. The average score among all students was 3.1 on a 4 point scale. Eighty-six percent (86%) rated instruction excellent or good.

Campuses showed some small differences. On the question of recommendations virtually no difference was found among campuses. On the rating of instruction the South Omaha campus had the highest "excellent" rating. However, the South Omaha and Southwest campuses were virtually the same when the top two ratings were combined. Indeed, the Fort Omaha campus was not far behind.

##### A. Willingness to Recommend

While a large proportion of students had recommended Metro Tech to others, there are some differences in terms of student characteristics.

Table 15 presents the characteristics of students who report recommending Metro Tech to others. As one might expect, a direct relationship occurred between instructional rating and willingness to recommend the school. While 85% of those who rated the instructor "excellent" had recommended Metro to others, only 29% of those who rated instruction "poor" did. Length of time at Metro Tech also apparently affected willingness to recommend it. The proportion of students who had recommended Metro Tech steadily increased from 69% of those in their first quarter to 87% of those with seven or more quarters at Metro Tech.

Full-time and day students also tended to be more likely to recommend than part-time or night students and those on degree or certificate programs more than those not in a program. Likewise, students receiving financial aid recommended it more than those who did not receive aid.

Less difference was found among students based on educational objectives, but those with a new career or personal interest orientation were more favorable than those updating an existing skill or with an unspecified objective. Those who chose a campus because of friends were very likely to recommend it to others. Still, those who chose their campus for the more common reason of convenience or program had high rates of recommending.

Generally, the older the student the more likely he/she was to recommend the school, although the youngest group (18-20 years old) did show the third highest rate. Interestingly, those unemployed or employed fewer hours were more supportive of the school than the more fully employed. Perhaps those less fully employed had more acquaintances who would be interested in Metro's job skill training curriculum.

#### B. Instructional Rating

The instructional ratings presented in the table are less consistent. The table presents both the percentage in each category rating instruction "excellent" and the combined "excellent" and "good" percentage. With very few exceptions, the instructional rating was at least good. Percentages in excess of 80% were consistent, and variation from category to category was relatively small (usually no more than 5 percentage points).

The relatively clear patterns that emerged in the analysis of the recommendation question dissolved when ratings were considered. In some cases the pattern is parallel, while in others it is opposite, and in still others no clear pattern exists.



TABLE 15

WILLINGNESS TO RECOMMEND AND INSTRUCTIONAL RATING  
BY STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	% Recommending Metro Tech	% Rating Instruction Excellent or Good
<u>Instruction Rating</u>		
Excellent	85	
Good	78	
Fair	63	
Poor	29	
Have recommended		34
Have not recommended		20
<u>Number of Quarters at Metro Tech</u>		
1	69	39
2-3	79	29
4-6	84	27
7 or more	87	25
<u>Full/Part time</u>		
Part time	75	32
Full time	80	29
<u>Day/Night</u>		
Night students	76	29
Day students	80	33
<u>Degree Status</u>		
Non-program students	69	36
Certificate students	79	35
Degree students	80	28
<u>Financial Aid</u>		
Unassisted students	76	32
Assisted students	79	30
<u>Education Objective</u>		
Unspecified (other)	68	21
Update job skill	76	31
Personal interest	78	27
Prepare for 1st career	79	31
Change career	79	34
<u>Reason for Choosing Campus</u>		
Unspecified (other)	70	29
Convenience of campus	78	30
Program only offered here	78	30
Atmosphere	83	47
Friends	96	32
<u>Age</u>		
18-20	78	26
21-24	72	27
25-29	76	69
30-39	81	35
40 and over	84	38
<u>Employment</u>		
Not employed	79	38
Less than 10 hrs.	79	25
10-19 hrs.	81	25
20-34 hrs	77	27
35 +	77	29

### C. Evaluation by Program

Analyzing the evaluation of programs is difficult in that several had so few students that the opinion of one or two students would have a massive and potentially misleading effect on percentages. However, since variation in evaluations by program occurred, the analysis is suggestive of program strengths and weaknesses, at least for the larger programs. Table 16 presents the percent of students who indicated they had recommended Metro Tech and the percent rating instruction "excellent" and "excellent" or "good." Both values for major categories and individual programs are presented.

In terms of recommendations by major category, the strengths (more than 84% recommending) appeared to be in the Apparel Arts, Drafting Technology, Horticulture, Ophthalmic, Photography, Private Security, Respiratory Therapy, and Youth Services programs. Three others--Hearing Impaired Interpreters, Secretarial Science, and Civil Engineering--all had 84% recommending. "Weaknesses" appeared in several programs with fewer than 75% of students recommending. These were Agriculture, Auto Body Technology, Graphic Arts, and Keypunch.\*

Programs within the major categories tended to reflect the overall evaluation, but individual programs did show some variation, especially in the larger major categories such as Business.

In terms of instructional ratings, the overall proportion of students ranking instruction as "excellent" was 31%; 87% rated it "good" or better. These values may be used to assess whether programs are receiving more or less than average ratings. Again, values for small programs can be misleading whether larger or smaller than average. Drafting, Horticulture, Keypunch, Private Security, and Welding Technology stood out in the "excellent" ratings, having values higher than 40%. In contrast, Youth Services, Respiratory Therapy, Ophthalmic, Hospitality, Electronics Technology, Business, and Air Conditioning seemed to have fewer (22% or less) "excellent" ratings. Youth Services, Respiratory Therapy, and Air Conditioning as well showed relatively low values even for ratings of "good" or better.

As with recommendations, when ratings were analyzed by individual program rather than major category, variations within major categories were visible. By and large, however, these were relatively few and small.

---

\*In addition the Auto Parts Technology and Banking and Finance programs received lower ratings from their few enrollees, but these programs had too few students for the numbers to be meaningful. One student accounts for too large a percentage.

TABLE 16

PERCENT RECOMMENDING METRO TECH AND  
PERCENT RATING INSTRUCTION HIGH BY PROGRAM

	N	% Recommending	% Rating Instruction	
			Excellent	Excellent or Good
<u>Agricultural Program</u>	13	69	38	100
Agricultural business management	3	100	33	100
Agricultural chemicals technology	4	75	25	100
Farm and ranch management	6	50	50	100
<u>Air Conditioning Technology</u>	69	75	15	78
Associate	60	72	15	77
Certificate	9	100	11	89
<u>Apparel Arts</u>	8	88	38	75
Associate	5	80	40	100
Certificate	3	100	33	33
<u>Auto - Body Technology</u>	39	72	28	85
Associate	32	72	28	88
Certificate	3	67	33	100
Painting specialist	1	0	0	100
Radiator repair specialist	1	100	0	100
Upholstering and trim specialist	2	100	50	50
<u>Automotive Mechanics</u>	204	81	31	86
Mechanics	173	81	31	85
Brake and alignment specialist	9	89	22	89
Engine rebuilding specialist	8	75	50	100
New and used vehicle preparation	1	100	0	100
Service station mechanic and operator	2	50	0	100
Sport and specialty engine mechanics	3	67	0	67
Tune-up and A/C specialist	9	89	56	89
<u>Automotive Parts Technology</u>	2	50	50	100
<u>Banking and Finance</u>	3	67	0	100
<u>Business</u>	423	79	22	84
Accounting	111	85	27	83
Bookkeeping	43	77	35	87
Business management option	132	77	14	84
Computer programming	65	72	19	89
Merchandise management	17	88	24	65
Real estate	22	73	33	81
Real estate management	8	63	25	88
Retailing	1	100	100	100
Supervisory management	22	86	9	91
Transportation and distribution mgmt.	2	100	6	100
<u>Child Care</u>	34	76	29	94
Assistant teacher	8	50	0	75
Head teacher-director	14	71	43	100
Technician training	12	92	33	100
<u>Civil Engineering Technology</u>	19	84	47	96
Associate	19	84	47	96
<u>Commercial Art</u>	26	77	35	96
<u>Dental Assisting</u>	29	76	52	90

TABLE 16  
Continued

	N	% Recommending	% Rating Instruction	
			Excellent	Excellent or Good
<u>Drafting Technology</u>	43	86	42	95
Drafting and design	42	88	42	93
Drafting	1	0	0	100
<u>Electronics Technology</u>	72	71	18	81
Associate	69	71	17	81
Certificate	3	67	33	67
<u>Food Marketing and Distribution</u>	1	0	0	100
<u>Graphic Arts (Printing)</u>	20	60	35	90
Associate	16	69	44	94
Certificate	4	25	0	75
<u>Horticulture</u>	25	96	56	96
Floriculture	5	100	40	100
General horticulture	11	91	73	91
Landscape development	6	100	50	100
Nursery management	1	100	0	100
Turfgrass and recreational grounds mgmt.	2	100	80	100
<u>Hospitality</u>	21	76	24	81
Food service	1	100	0	0
Food service management	6	50	0	83
Hotel/restaurant management	15	80	33	80
<u>Interior Design Assistant</u>	29	79	35	90
<u>Hearing Impaired Interpreter</u>	19	84	37	89
<u>Keypunch</u>	11	64	73	100
<u>Ophthalmic Technology</u>	13	92	15	92
Prescription technician	6	100	17	83
Technology	7	86	14	100
<u>Photography (Commercial)</u>	40	85	30	87
<u>Practical Nursing</u>	3	100	33	67
<u>Private Security</u>	54	85	59	94
Private security	3	67	33	100
Private security management	51	86	61	100
<u>Respiratory Therapy Technician</u>	14	86	21	79
<u>Secretarial Science</u>	166	84	29	80
Clerk typist	25	64	40	84
Executive secretary	40	78	28	82
General office clerical	54	93	33	85
Legal secretary	31	94	45	94
Medical secretary	16	81	31	87
<u>Surgical Technology</u>	6	100	33	100
<u>Welding and Fabrication Technology</u>	115	81	43	86
Welding and fabrication	77	83	43	87
Welding technology	38	76	92	87
<u>Youth Services Specialist</u>	19	86	21	69

## V. Needs

Three questions are analyzed in assessing the needs of Metro Tech students. The first and most important deals with new program interests. The other two, dealing with career and job placement services, are more administrative in nature.

### A. New Program Interests by Campus

About 75% (1,450) of all respondents answered the question: "If you were just beginning your education at Metro, which one of these programs would interest you most?" All 30 of the programs (or program areas) were named by at least five respondents.\*

The most popular new potential program (Diesel Mechanics) was listed by only 9.2% of the students answering this question. Other popular programs included: Human Services Technician (8.7%), Veterinarian Assistant (8.3%), Medical Office and Record Assistant (7.1%), and Carpenter (6.9%).

At the other extreme, several of the construction specialties attracted less than 1% of the current students' preferences (Cement Worker, Drywall Installer, and Operating Engineer).

Table 17 presents these data for each of the campuses as well as for all three campuses combined. Some inter-campus variations were evident. For example, Human Services Technician appealed to 14.5% of the Fort Omaha students but only 7.4% of those at South Omaha and 6.3% of those at the Southwest campus. Similarly, the Diesel Mechanics program appealed to 13.2% at South Omaha and 10.7% at Fort Omaha but to only 4.5% at the Southwest campus.

Interest in these programs, generally, was not concentrated at any one campus. Of the 30 potential programs and program categories, only 6 met the earlier operational definitions of a program predominantly at a single campus. Of these, 4 programs were preferred predominantly by Southwest campus students (Construction Technology in general, the construction field sub-program for Electricians and Sheet Metal workers, and Machinery Technology) and 2 were dominated by Fort Omaha students (the construction sub-fields of Brick and Block Layer and Iron Worker). The earlier operational definition of mutually shared

---

\*It should be noted that this question is not an ideal measure of interest in new prospective programs since the question posited a hypothetical situation. In addition the lower response rate of women (71% compared to 78% of the men) may indicate less real interest in any of the programs than would be inferred from their "forced" answers. Some of the programs preferred predominantly by women may show an inflated interest due to a restricted number of alternatives to their current programs.

TABLE 17

## NEW PROGRAM INTERESTS BY CAMPUS

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Southwest		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Diesel mechanics	37	10.7	71	13.2	25	4.5	133	9.2
Sport and specialty engine mechanics	20	5.8	34	6.3	25	4.5	79	5.5
<u>Construction Technology</u>	9	2.6	7	1.3	25	4.5	41	2.8
Brick and block layer	10	2.9	4	.7	5	.9	19	1.3
Carpenter	23	6.6	42	7.8	35	6.3	100	6.9
Cement worker	2	.6	1	.2	2	.4	5	.3
Drywall installer	1	.3	3	.6	3	.5	7	.5
Electrician	9	2.6	16	3.0	38	1.8	63	4.4
Heavy equipment operator	12	3.5	10	1.9	10	1.8	32	2.2
Iron worker	15	4.3	3	.6	5	.9	23	1.6
Operating engineer	3	.9	3	.6	3	.5	9	.6
Plumbing and pipe fitting	6	1.7	10	1.9	15	2.7	31	2.2
Sheet metal	2	.6	0	0	12	2.2	14	1.0
Veterinarian assistant	29	8.4	46	8.6	45	8.1	120	8.3
Machinery technology	12	3.5	13	2.4	29	5.2	54	3.8
<u>Electronics</u>	5	1.4	13	2.4	13	2.3	31	2.2
Electro-mechanical technology	8	2.3	34	6.3	28	5.0	70	4.9
Instrumentation	5	1.4	14	2.6	16	2.9	35	2.4
<u>Dental program</u>	4	1.2	3	.6	5	.9	12	.8
Dental lab technician	4	1.2	10	1.9	9	1.6	23	1.6
Dental hygiene	3	.9	14	2.6	13	2.3	30	2.1
Medical office and record assistant	22	6.4	46	8.6	34	6.1	102	7.1
Nursing assistant	6	1.7	13	2.4	12	2.2	31	2.2
Bio-medical technician	4	1.2	9	1.7	9	1.6	22	1.5
EEG and EKG technician	8	2.3	7	1.3	11	2.0	26	1.8
Medical lab technician	14	4.0	12	2.2	23	4.1	49	3.4
Surgical technician assistant	2	.6	14	2.6	14	2.5	30	2.1
X-ray technician	12	3.5	16	3.0	12	2.2	40	2.8
Media production	9	2.6	30	5.6	45	8.1	84	5.8
Human services	50	14.5	40	7.4	35	6.3	125	8.7
Total	346		538		556		1,440	

programs was met by 11 programs; in 10 of the 11 programs Fort Omaha (with its smaller enrollment) failed to be as heavily interested as the other two campuses.

An alternative operational definition--50% or more of the preferences--still indicated only 8 of the 30 potentially new programs preferred predominantly at one campus (Diesel Mechanics at South Omaha and Media Production at Southwest were the additions to the previous list). See Table 18.

#### B. New Program Interests and Student Characteristics

To help assess the kinds of students (and therefore the potential market) interested in the various proposed courses, those interests were analyzed by student characteristics.

Most of the potential programs listed on the questionnaire were of greater appeal to men than women (17 of the 30 specific and broad program designations). Men were over-represented in the fields related to mechanics, machinery, and electronics and under-represented in the health fields, media production, and animal and human service fields. Women found more difficult accepting the instructions accompanying the question: "If you were just beginning your education at Metro, which one of these programs would interest you most?" Approximately 29% of the women did not answer this question, compared to 22% of the men. See Table 19.

Most of the courses showed relatively equal interest between full- and part-time students. To focus in on those with interest more concentrated, only programs with more than 1% overall interest and in which one group expressed at least 60% of the total interest are discussed. Three potential programs were more attractive to full- than to part-time students. These were Diesel Mechanics, Heavy Equipment Operator, and the Dental program. Seven were most attractive to part-time students: Electrician, Electronics, Instrumentation, Medical Office and Records Assistant, Medical Lab Technician, Surgical Technology Assistant, and X-ray Technician. See Table 20.

A similar criterion was used in assessing interest among day and night students. Five programs--Brick and Block Layer, Heavy Equipment Operator, Dental Hygienist, Nursing Assistant, and Human Services Technician--were interesting mostly to day students.

#### C. New Program Interest and Current Programs

An examination of the preferences among the potential programs by students enrolled in current programs indicated that some of the new programs had broader

TABLE 18

## NEW PROGRAM INTEREST ACROSS CAMPUS

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Southwest	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Diesel mechanics	37	27.8	71	53.4	25	18.8
Sport & specialty engine mechanics	20	25.3	34	43.0	25	31.6
<u>Construction technologies</u>	9	22.0	7	17.1	25	61.0
Brick and block layer	10	52.6	4	21.1	5	26.3
Carpenter	23	23.0	42	42.0	35	35.0
Cement worker	2	40.0	1	20.0	2	40.0
Drywall installer	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9
Electrician	9	14.3	16	25.4	38	60.3
Heavy equipment operator	12	37.5	10	31.3	10	31.3
Iron worker	15	65.2	3	13.0	5	21.7
Operating engineer	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3
Plumber and pipefitter	6	19.4	10	32.3	15	48.4
Sheet metal worker	2	14.3	0	.0	12	85.7
Veterinarian assistant	29	24.2	46	38.3	45	37.5
Machinery technology	12	22.2	13	24.1	29	53.7
<u>Electronics</u>	5	16.1	13	41.9	13	41.9
Electro-mechanical technology	8	11.4	34	48.6	28	40.0
Instrumentation	5	14.3	14	40.0	16	45.7
<u>Dental program</u>	4	33.3	3	25.0	5	41.7
Dental lab technician	4	17.4	10	43.5	9	39.1
Dental hygiene	3	10.0	14	46.7	13	43.3
Medical office and record assistant	22	21.6	46	45.1	34	33.3
Nursing assistant	6	19.4	13	41.9	12	38.7
Bio-medical technician	4	18.2	9	40.9	9	40.9
EEG and EKG technician	8	30.8	7	26.9	11	42.3
Medical lab technician	14	28.6	12	24.5	23	46.9
Surgical technician	2	6.7	14	46.7	14	46.7
X-ray technician	12	30.0	16	40.0	12	30.0
Media production	9	10.7	30	35.7	45	53.6
Human services	50	40.0	40	32.0	35	28.0
Total	346	24.0	538	37.4	556	38.6



TABLE 19

## NEW PROGRAM INTEREST BY SEX

	Male		Female		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	
Diesel mechanics	120	92.3	10	7.7	130
Sport and specialty engine mechanics	70	85.4	12	14.6	82
<u>Construction technology</u>	35	81.4	8	18.6	43
Brick and block layer	16	84.2	3	15.8	19
Carpenter	75	75.8	24	24.2	99
Cement worker	4	100.0	0	.0	4
Drywall installer	6	85.7	1	14.3	7
Electrician	55	87.3	8	12.7	63
Heavy equipment operator	31	93.9	2	6.1	33
Iron worker	19	90.5	2	9.5	21
Operating engineer	6	66.7	3	33.3	9
Plumber and pipefitter	30	96.8	1	3.2	31
Sheet metal	13	92.9	1	7.1	14
Veterinarian assistant	32	26.7	88	73.3	120
Machinery technology	50	89.3	6	10.7	56
<u>Electronics</u>	25	83.3	5	16.7	30
Electro-mechanical technology	60	85.7	10	14.3	70
Instrumentation	31	88.6	4	11.4	35
<u>Dental program</u>	4	33.3	8	66.7	12
Dental lab technician	7	30.4	16	69.6	23
Dental hygiene	4	13.8	25	86.2	29
Medical office and record assistant	4	4.0	96	96.0	100
Nursing assistant	3	10.3	26	89.7	29
Bio-medical technician	10	45.5	12	54.5	22
EEG and EKG technician	7	26.9	19	73.1	26
Medical lab technician	13	26.5	36	73.5	49
Surgical technician	5	16.7	25	83.3	30
X-ray technician	17	42.5	23	57.5	40
Media production	32	37.6	53	62.4	85
Human services	<u>28</u>	<u>22.4</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>77.6</u>	<u>125</u>
Total	812	56.5	624	43.5	1,436

TABLE 20

NEW PROGRAM INTEREST BY FULL-AND PART-TIME STUDENTS  
AND BY DAY AND NIGHT STUDENTS

	Full		Part		Day		Night	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Diesel mechanics	85	63.9	48	36.1	54	41.2	77	58.7
Sport and specialty engine mechanics	47	57.3	35	42.7	42	51.2	40	48.8
<u>Construction technology</u>	24	54.5	20	45.5	52	56.8	19	43.2
Brick and block layer	10	52.6	9	47.4	12	63.2	7	36.8
Carpenter	44	44.0	56	56.0	48	48.0	52	52.0
Cement worker	0	.0	4	100.0	1	20.0	4	80.0
Drywall installer	5	71.4	2	28.6	4	57.1	3	42.9
Electrician	22	34.9	41	65.1	26	41.3	37	58.7
Heavy equipment operator	23	69.7	10	30.3	23	69.7	10	30.3
Iron worker	11	50.0	11	50.0	9	39.1	14	60.9
Operating engineer	3	33.3	6	66.7	3	33.3	6	66.7
Plumber and pipefitter	16	51.6	15	48.4	11	35.5	20	64.5
Sheet metal	5	35.7	9	64.3	4	28.6	10	71.4
Veterinarian assistant	60	50.0	60	50.0	71	59.6	48	40.4
Machinery technology	31	55.4	24	42.9	28	50.0	28	50.0
<u>Electronics</u>	12	38.7	19	61.3	17	54.8	14	45.2
Electro-mechanical technology	34	48.6	36	51.4	30	42.9	40	57.1
Instrumentation	13	37.1	22	62.1	16	45.7	19	54.3
<u>Dental program</u>	8	66.7	4	33.3	6	50.0	6	50.0
Dental lab technician	11	47.8	12	52.8	11	47.8	12	52.2
Dental hygiene	17	56.7	13	43.3	22	73.3	8	26.7
Medical office and record assistant	31	31.7	69	68.3	61	59.8	41	40.2
Nursing assistant	18	58.1	13	41.9	20	64.5	11	35.5
Bio-medical technician	9	40.9	13	59.1	12	54.5	10	45.5
EEG and EKG technician	11	44.0	14	56.0	12	48.0	13	52.0
Medical lab technician	18	36.0	32	64.0	29	59.2	20	40.8
Surgical technician	6	20.0	24	80.0	17	56.7	13	43.3
X-ray technician	14	35.0	26	65.0	19	47.5	21	52.5
Media production	35	41.1	50	58.8	44	51.7	41	48.3
Human services	54	42.5	73	57.5	78	61.4	49	38.6

appeal than others. For instance, the Veterinarian Assistant program drew interest from students enrolled in 36 programs with its greatest concentration among enrolled students drawing only 16% (from the Business Management option program). In contrast Diesel Mechanics drew from only 19 programs with its greatest concentration among enrolled students being 61% (from Automotive Mechanics).

#### D. New Program Interest and Preferred Campus

Since more students are likely to be attracted to a new program if it is offered at the most preferred campus(es), new program interests were analyzed in relation to campus preferences. The analysis, however, was limited to the 20 programs and program categories receiving at least 2.0% interest (29 or more students).

Table 28 shows that 4 of the programs were predominantly preferred by those naming the South Omaha campus, 7 were mutually shared by those preferring the South Omaha or Elkhorn campus, and 9 were considerably shared by all three preferred campus locations. Of 7 mutually shared programs, 4 had a majority of students preferring the South Omaha campus. Similarly 2 of the 9 considerably shared programs were preferred by a majority of students favoring South Omaha. The relationship between a preference for South Omaha and a preference for a new program is not surprising since almost half (49%) of the students said they preferred South Omaha, while 27% favored Elkhorn, and 23% chose Fort Omaha. See Table 21.

The 4 programs preferred predominantly by students favoring the South Omaha campus were: Diesel Mechanics, Electrician, Plumbing and Pipe-fitting, and Electronics-Instrumentation. The 7 mutually shared programs were: Veterinarian Assistant, Machinery Technology, Electronics, Electro-mechanical Technology, Nursing Assistant, Surgical Technician Assistant, and Media Production. The 9 programs which were considerably shared were: Sport and Specialty Engine Mechanics, Construction Technology, Carpenter, Heavy Equipment Operator, Dental Hygiene, Medical Office and Record Assistant, Medical Lab Technician, X-Ray Technician, and Human Services Technician.

In summary, all but a few of the proposed programs attracted the interest of students. For most the attraction was across current campus, preferred campus, and type of student. This would indicate that these courses could be placed at any of the campuses with a reasonable assurance of success. A few, however,

TABLE 21

## NEW COURSE INTEREST ACROSS PREFERRED CAMPUS

	Fort Omaha		South Omaha		Elkhorn	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Diesel mechanics	25	19.1	85	64.9	21	16.0
Sport and specialty engine mechanics	22	26.8	42	51.2	18	22.0
<u>Construction technology</u>	16	36.4	15	34.1	13	29.5
Brick and block layer	9	50.0	3	16.7	6	33.3
Carpenter	24	23.5	49	48.0	29	28.4
Cement worker	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0
Drywall installer	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3
Electrician	13	21.3	34	55.7	14	23.0
Heavy equipment operator	9	27.3	15	45.5	9	27.3
Iron worker	10	43.5	9	39.1	4	17.4
Operating engineer	2	22.2	4	44.4	3	33.3
Plumber and pipefitter	3	10.0	21	70.0	6	20.0
Sheet metal	4	28.6	4	28.6	6	42.9
Veterinarian assistant	21	17.6	62	52.1	36	30.3
Machinery technology	8	14.3	27	48.2	21	37.5
<u>Electronics</u>	4	13.3	17	56.7	9	30.0
Electro-mechanical technology	6	8.6	42	60.0	22	31.4
Instrumentation	5	14.3	20	57.1	10	28.6
<u>Dental program</u>	4	33.3	5	41.7	3	25.0
Dental lab technician	3	13.0	13	56.5	7	30.4
Dental hygiene	8	26.7	12	40.0	10	33.3
Medical office and record assistant	22	21.6	51	50.0	29	28.4
Nursing assistant	5	16.7	14	46.7	11	36.6
Bio-medical technician	5	22.7	14	63.6	3	13.6
EEG and EKG technician	8	30.8	12	46.2	6	23.1
Medical lab technician	15	30.6	15	30.6	19	38.8
Surgical technician	4	14.3	13	46.4	11	39.3
X-ray technician	12	30.0	20	50.0	8	20.0
Media production	14	16.3	41	47.7	13	36.0
Human services	50	40.0	48	38.4	27	21.6

did show a special attraction to particular campuses or student types. For these either the differences in attraction could be capitalized upon, or efforts would need to be made to diversify their attractiveness if the special attraction is deemed to be a liability to the success of the new course.

#### E. Career Development and Job Placement Needs

About 40% of all reporting students indicated a desire for career development services while 46% indicated a need for job placement. A striking relationship was found between the two needs. The same types of students expressed the same comparative needs for both services. By campus these needs were greatest at the Fort Omaha campus and least desired at South Omaha. In terms of preferred campus, the distribution remained the same. See Table 22.

Those in their first three quarters were more desirous of both services. Those at least in their seventh quarter were less so. Full-time, day students, and those enrolled in programs (especially in one-year certificate programs) all indicated larger percentages needing the services.

Those whose educational objective was a first career showed a high desire for these services, especially job placement. Those seeking skills in order to change careers, too, frequently mentioned these needs. As might be expected, those who were attending Metro Tech to satisfy a personal interest were least desirous of these services.

Also paralleling expectations was the expression of need related to age. The older the student group, the fewer who expressed a desire for these services. A young group newly entering the job market of full-time day students relatively new to Metro Tech epitomizes the basic clientele for these services.

#### F. Career Development and Job Placement Needs by Program

The need for assistance in career development and the need for assistance in job placement were expressed by 41% and 46% of the students, respectively, but these needs varied greatly by program. For instance, only 24% of those enrolled in the Horticulture programs indicated a need for career development assistance, but 9 of the 11 (82%) students enrolled in the Key punch program did. See Table 23.

Similarly, wide variations were found by program in the proportions requesting job placement assistance. Approximately one-third of the students in the Auto Mechanics and Private Security programs said they needed job placement assistance compared to three-fourths or more in the Ophthalmic, Key punch, Dental Assistant, and Graphic Arts programs.

TABLE 22

STUDENTS DESIRING CAREER DEVELOPMENT OR JOB PLACEMENT SERVICE  
BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

	Career Development Services		Job Placement Services	
	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Campus</u>				
Fort Omaha	198	43	245	54
South Omaha	268	39	279	40
Southwest	310	42	358	48
<u>Preferred Campus</u>				
Fort Omaha	204	45	239	54
South Omaha	362	38	394	42
Elkhorn	218	41	251	47
<u>Quarter @ M.T.</u>				
1st	220	43	229	45
2nd - 3rd	399	44	404	51
4th - 6th	150	39	169	44
7th or more	66	27	90	37
<u>Full Time/Part Time</u>				
Full time	386	46	501	61
Part time	401	37	377	35
<u>Day/Night</u>				
Day	466	47	592	60
Night	319	34	292	31
<u>Degree Status</u>				
Associate	497	43	557	48
Certificate	155	45	200	58
Non-program	131	31	133	31
<u>Financial Assistance</u>				
Assisted	372	40	448	48
Unassisted	402	41	431	44
<u>Educational Objective</u>				
First career	253	54	336	72
New career	296	47	337	54
Update job skill	150	33	116	25
Personal interest	56	20	65	23
Other	25	33	25	33
<u>Age</u>				
18-20	202	49	255	62
21-24	198	48	225	55
25-29	147	39	153	40
30-39	154	35	166	38
40 or over	83	29	92	33
Total	794	41	893	46

TABLE 23

## CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND JOB PLACEMENT NEEDS BY PROGRAM

	N	Career Development		Job Placement	
		No.	%	No.	%
<u>Agricultural Program</u>	13	7	53.8	9	69.2
Agricultural business management	3	2	66.7	2	66.7
Agricultural chemicals technology	4	2	50.0	3	75.0
Farm and ranch management	6	4	66.7	4	66.7
<u>Air Conditioning Technology</u>	69	22	31.9	45	65.2
Associate	60	21	35.0	27	45.0
Certificate	9	1	11.1	4	44.4
<u>Apparel Arts</u>	8	4	50.0	3	37.5
Associate	5	2	40.0	1	20.0
Certificate	3	2	66.7	2	66.7
<u>Automotive Body Technology</u>	39	21	53.8	18	46.2
Associate	32	18	56.3	16	50.0
Certificate	3	2	66.7	1	33.3
Painting specialist	1	0	.0	0	.0
Radiator repair	1	0	.0	0	.0
Upholstery and trim	2	1	50.0	1	50.0
<u>Automotive Mechanics</u>	204	59	28.9	67	32.8
Mechanics	172	43	25.0	51	29.7
Brake and alignment specialist	9	4	44.4	4	44.4
Engine rebuilding specialist	8	5	62.5	4	50.0
New and used vehicle preparation	1	0	.0	0	.0
Service station operator	2	2	100.0	2	100.0
Sport and specialty engine	3	2	66.7	2	66.7
Tune-up and A/C specialist	9	3	33.3	4	44.4
<u>Automotive Parts Technology</u>	2	2	100.0	2	100.0
<u>Banking and Finance</u>	3	1	33.3	3	100.0
<u>Business</u>	422	185	43.8	212	50.2
Accounting	111	53	47.7	69	17.1
Bookkeeping	42	21	50.0	24	57.1
Business management option	132	48	36.4	48	36.4
Computer programming	65	34	52.3	44	67.7
Merchandise management	17	10	58.8	10	58.8
Real estate	22	7	31.8	3	13.6
Real estate management	8	3	37.5	4	50.0
Retailing	1	0	.0	1	100.0
Supervisory management	22	8	36.4	8	36.4
Transportation and distribution mgmt.	2	1	50.0	1	50.0
<u>Child Care</u>	34	14	41.1	25	73.5
Assistant teacher	8	6	75.0	6	75.0
Head teacher-director	14	2	14.2	9	64.3
Technician training	12	6	50.0	10	83.3
<u>Civil Engineering</u>	20	8	40.0	10	50.0
Associate	20	8	40.0	10	50.0
<u>Commercial Art</u>	26	15	57.7	14	53.8
<u>Dental Assisting</u>	29	13	44.8	23	79.3

TABLE 23  
Continued

	N	Career Development		Job Placement	
		No.	%	No.	%
<u>Drafting Technology</u>	42	23	54.8	30	71.4
Drafting and design	41	22	53.7	29	70.7
Drafting	1	1	100.0	1	100.0
<u>Electronics Technology</u>	72	35	48.6	35	48.6
Associate	69	33	47.8	33	47.8
Certificate	3	2	66.7	2	66.7
<u>Food Marketing and Distribution</u>	1	1	100.0	0	.0
<u>Graphic Arts</u>	20	8	40.0	15	75.0
Associate	16	7	43.8	13	81.3
Certificate	4	1	25.0	2	50.0
<u>Horticulture</u>	25	6	24.0	13	52.0
Floriculture	5	0	.0	2	40.0
General horticulture	11	4	36.4	6	54.5
Landscape development	6	2	33.3	4	66.7
Nursery management	1	0	.0	0	.0
Turfgrass and recreational grounds mgmt.	2	0	.0	1	50.0
<u>Hospitality</u>	22	10	45.5	12	54.5
Food service	1	1	100.0	1	100.0
Food service management	6	3	50.0	4	66.7
Hotel/restaurant management	15	6	40.0	7	46.7
<u>Interior Design Assistant</u>	29	13	44.8	11	37.9
<u>Hearing Impaired Interpreter</u>	19	9	47.4	12	63.2
<u>Keypunch</u>	11	9	81.8	9	81.8
<u>Ophthalmic</u>	13	8	61.5	11	84.6
Prescription technician	6	3	50.0	4	66.7
Technology	7	5	71.4	7	100.0
<u>Photography</u>	40	21	52.5	19	47.5
<u>Practical Nursing</u>	3	1	33.3	1	33.3
<u>Private Security</u>	54	30	55.6	18	33.3
Private security	3	2	66.7	1	33.3
Private security management	51	28	54.9	17	33.3
<u>Respiratory Therapy</u>	14	5	35.7	7	50.0
<u>Secretarial Science</u>	166	74	44.6	96	57.8
Clerk typist	25	10	40.0	15	60.0
Executive secretary	40	22	55.0	26	65.0
General office clerical	54	27	50.0	29	53.7
Legal secretary	31	7	22.6	17	54.8
Medical secretary	16	8	50.0	9	56.3
<u>Surgical technology</u>	6	1	16.7	3	50.0
<u>Welding Technology</u>	114	33	28.9	44	38.6
Welding and fabrication	76	22	28.9	29	38.2
Welding technology	38	11	28.9	15	39.5
<u>Youth Services Specialist</u>	18	9	47.4	8	42.1



## VI. Summary

The survey of 1,957 students enrolled at Metropolitan Technical Community College done in the spring, 1980 provided a variety of information. The data on their characteristics were similar to earlier profiles of Metro Tech students. Most Metro students continued to be part time rather than full time and enrolled in a degree or certificate program rather than taking selected courses. Students were almost equally split between day and night courses. Only one-fifth were under 21 years of age. One-third earned under \$9,000, but one-fourth earned over \$20,000. Approximately 28% were not employed (slightly higher than earlier profiles) but almost half were employed full time. One-fourth were at Metro preparing for their first career and another third were there preparing for a career change. Over half of the students selected their campus because of its convenience.

The data for each campus indicated many similarities but several differences were noted. For example, the Fort Omaha campus compared to the other two campuses had a higher proportion of students who were full time, day time, enrolled in degree or certificate programs, preparing for their first career, and in the lower income group.

Data on program enrollment indicated that most major program categories were predominantly at one campus, with 8 at Southwest, 7 at South Omaha, and 4 at Fort Omaha. An analysis of program enrollment by preferred campus suggested a desire for greater decentralization (only 11 programs were predominantly preferred at one campus). The South Omaha campus showed the greatest increase in the ratio of preferred location to current location.

The question on preferred location also indicated that approximately 70% preferred to attend their present campus or its equivalent, with this proportion reaching 87% at South Omaha and 77% at Fort Omaha. Approximately 60% of the Southwest students preferred to transfer to the new Elkhorn Valley campus, and approximately that proportion of all Southwest students said they would attend that campus in the fall, 1980 (11% indicated they planned to transfer to South Omaha and 3% to Fort Omaha, with the others either completing their studies, transferring to another school, or not attending any school).

Metro Tech students' evaluation of the College were very favorable. Approximately 86% rated instruction excellent or good, 13% said it was fair, and only 1% rated it poor. More than three-fourths of the students had recommended it to others.

## APPENDIX

## SURVEY OF METROPOLITAN TECHNICAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS

Instructions: This questionnaire is to help evaluate and plan Metro Tech programs. Please answer each question to the best of your ability. Mark your choice on the answer sheet provided. Do not mark more than one response for each question. Thank you for your cooperation.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>FO</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>SW</u>
1. I am a student at:				
a) Ft. Omaha campus.	24%			
b) South Omaha campus.	36%			
c) Southwest campus.	39%			
d) an off-campus center.	2%			
2. This is my:				
a) 1st quarter at Metropolitan Technical Community College.	27%	25%	24%	28%
b) 2nd or 3rd quarter at Metropolitan Technical Community College.	41%	44%	41%	39%
c) 4th, 5th, or 6th quarter at Metropolitan Technical Community College.	20%	19%	23%	19%
d) 7th (or more) quarter at Metropolitan Technical Community College.	13%	12%	13%	14%
3. This quarter I am a:				
a) full-time student (12 or more credits).	44%	61%	41%	38%
b) part-time student (less than 12).	56%	39%	59%	62%
4. Most of my classes are:				
a) in the daytime.	51%	72%	43%	45%
b) in the evening.	49%	28%	57%	55%
c) on Saturday.	*			
5. I am enrolled in:				
a) an associate degree program (2-year).	60%	62%	61%	60%
b) a certificate program (1 year or less).	18%	24%	18%	15%
c) neither (in selected courses only).	22%	14%	22%	25%
6. I am receiving financial assistance to attend Metro Tech.				
a) yes	49%	61%	49%	40%
b) no — skip to question 11	51%	39%	51%	60%

	<u>Total</u>	<u>FO</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>SW</u>
7. I am receiving financial assistance from Metro Tech (e.g., BEOG, SEOG).				
a) yes	18%	31%	16%	12%
b) no				
8. I am receiving veterans educational benefits.				
a) yes	25%	26%	27%	22%
b) no				
9. I am receiving some reimbursement for educational expenses from my employer.				
a) yes	8%	5%	7%	10%
b) no				
10. I am receiving other forms of financial assistance to attend school (e.g., CETA, WIN, voc-rehab).				
a) yes	9%	14%	7%	7%
b) no				
11. My main <u>objective</u> for attending Metro Tech is:				
a) to prepare for my first career or job.	24%	30%	22%	24%
b) to prepare for a change in career or job.	33%	31%	30%	37%
c) to upgrade current job skills.	24%	18%	27%	23%
d) for personal interest or development (not related to a job).	15%	16%	17%	12%
e) other.	4%	5%	4%	4%
12. The <u>main</u> reason I am enrolled at this campus of Metro Tech is:				
a) program is offered only at this campus.	26%	25%	20%	33%
b) this campus is most convenient to reach.	56%	58%	63%	47%
c) this campus has the most appealing atmosphere.	6%	6%	4%	7%
d) friends are attending this campus.	1%	1%	2%	1%
e) a reason other than the above.	11%	10%	11%	11%
13. If I could take my classes at any of the 3 campuses that will be in operation in 1980-81, I would prefer to attend:				
a) Ft. Omaha (30th and Fort).		77%	5%	8%
b) South Omaha (27th and Q).		16%	87%	32%
c) Elkhorn Valley Campus (204th and Dodge).		7%	8%	60%
14. I first heard about Metropolitan Technical Community College from:				
a) a high school counselor, teacher, or principal.	9%	15%	8%	8%
b) a representative of Metropolitan Technical Community College.	6%	6%	7%	4%
c) a friend or relative.	38%	38%	38%	38%
d) newspaper or other printed notice.	37%	30%	37%	40%
e) radio or TV.	10%	10%	10%	10%

	<u>Total</u>	<u>FO</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>SW</u>
15. I have recommended Metropolitan Technical Community College to another person.				
a) yes	78%	77%	79%	77%
b) no	22%	23%	21%	23%
16. I would rate the quality of the instruction I received at Metropolitan Technical Community College as:				
a) excellent.	31%	28%	33%	29%
b) good.	55%	55%	53%	58%
c) fair.	13%	15%	13%	12%
d) poor.	1%	1%	1%	1%
17. Concerning the career development service at Metro Tech:				
a) I would like help to plan a career.	41%	43%	39%	42%
b) I do not need help to plan a career.	59%	57%	61%	58%
18. Concerning the job placement service at Metro Tech:				
a) I would like to have the job placement service to help me find a job.	46%	54%	40%	48%
b) I do not need the job placement service to help me find a job.	54%	46%	60%	52%
19. I usually travel to Metropolitan Technical Community College <u>from</u> :				
a) home.	79%	86%	78%	78%
b) work.	19%	13%	21%	21%
c) other.	1%	1%	1%	1%
20. I usually travel from Metropolitan Technical Community College <u>to</u> :				
a) home.	81%	76%	84%	83%
b) work.	14%	16%	10%	14%
c) other.	5%	8%	6%	3%
21. It is about _____ miles from my <u>home</u> to this campus.				
a) less than 2	16%	19%	17%	11%
b) 2 - 4	24%	33%	23%	21%
c) 5 - 9	28%	26%	34%	25%
d) 10 - 14	17%	11%	13%	25%
e) 15 or more	15%	12%	13%	19%
22. It is about _____ miles from my place of <u>work</u> to this campus.				
a) less than 2	12%	12%	10%	10%
b) 2 - 4	12%	10%	12%	14%
c) 5 - 9	25%	24%	32%	20%
d) 10 or more	26%	22%	22%	33%
e) I do not work	25%	32%	23%	23%

	<u>Total</u>	<u>FO</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>SW</u>
23. I am a:				
a) male.	54%	55%	52%	55%
b) female.	46%	45%	48%	45%
24. My race/ethnic group is:				
a) American Indian.	1%	2%	1%	1%
b) Asian.	2%	1%	3%	2%
c) Black.	10%	29%	5%	3%
d) Caucasian/white.	84%	65%	88%	93%
e) Hispanic.	3%	3%	4%	2%
25. My age is:				
a) 18 - 20.	21%	25%	20%	20%
b) 21 - 24.	21%	21%	20%	22%
c) 25 - 29.	20%	23%	17%	21%
d) 30 - 39.	23%	21%	23%	24%
e) 40 or over.	15%	11%	19%	13%
26. I am currently:				
a) married.	46%	36%	51%	48%
b) not married.	54%	64%	49%	52%
27. The best description of my financial situation is:				
a) I am largely dependent on parents for support, and consider my "family income" as that of my parents.				
b) I am largely independent from parents, and consider my "family income" as that which I and/or my spouse earn.	16%	19%	16%	16%
	84%	81%	84%	84%
28. My "family income" is:				
a) less than \$9,000.	31%	43%	29%	25%
b) \$9,000 - 11,999.	15%	18%	15%	12%
c) \$12,000 - 14,999.	14%	14%	13%	13%
d) \$15,000 - 19,999.	15%	11%	16%	16%
e) \$20,000 or more.	25%	14%	26%	33%
29. I am employed at a job outside my home:				
a) not at all.	28%	35%	26%	25%
b) less than 10 hours a week.	4%	5%	4%	3%
c) 10 - 19 hours.	8%	10%	8%	8%
d) 20 - 34 hours.	11%	13%	11%	11%
e) 35 hours or more.	50%	37%	52%	54%

	<u>Total</u>	<u>FO</u>	<u>SO</u>	<u>SW</u>
30. I am enrolled in a degree or certificate program at Metropolitan Technical Community College.				
a) yes	76%	83%	76%	73%
b) no — Skip to question 32.	24%	17%	24%	27%

31. If you are enrolled in a degree or certificate program, please indicate the one you are enrolled in Section 2 on the back of the answer sheet (at the top of the page); please also write the number of your choice at the head of that column.

<u>Total</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>Agricultural Program</u>	1.6%	31 Real Estate
.2%	01 Agricultural Business Management	.5%	32 Real Estate Management
.3%	02 Agricultural Chemicals Technology	.1%	33 Retailing
-	03 Agricultural Cooperatives Management	1.4%	34 Supervisory Management
.4%	04 Farm and Ranch Management	-	35 Transportation and Distribution
		.1%	36 Transportation and Distribution Management
	<u>Air Conditioning, Refrigeration and Heating Technology</u>		<u>Child Care Program</u>
3.8%	05 Two Year Associate Degree	.5%	37 Child Care Assistant Teacher
.6%	06 Nine Month Certificate	.9%	38 Child Care Head Teacher-Director
		.8%	39 Child Care Technician Training
	<u>Apparel Arts Program</u>		<u>Civil Engineering Technology Program</u>
.3%	07 Two Year Associate Degree		
.2%	08 One Year Certificate	1.3%	40 Two Year Associate Degree Option - Southwest Campus
1.5%	09 <u>Architectural Technology</u>	-	41 Nine Month Certificate Option - Southwest Campus
	<u>Automotive Body Technology Program</u>		
2.0%	10 Automotive Body Technology (Two Year Associate Degree)	1.7%	42 <u>Commercial Art</u>
.2%	11 (Nine Month Certificate)	1.8%	43 <u>Dental Assisting</u>
-	12 Automotive Body and Frame Specialist		<u>Drafting Technology Program</u>
.1%	13 Automotive Painting Specialist	2.7%	44 Drafting and Design Technology Option
.1%	14 Automotive Radiator Repair	.1%	45 Drafting Technology Option
.1%	15 Automotive Upholstering and Trim		<u>Electronics Technology Program</u>
	<u>Automotive Mechanics Program</u>		
11.0%	16 Automotive Mechanics	4.4%	46 Two Year Associate Degree
.6%	17 Brake and Alignment Specialist	.2%	47 Nine Month Certificate
.5%	18 Engine Rebuilding Specialist		
-	19 Fleet Maintenance and Management	.1%	48 <u>Food Marketing and Distribution Program</u>
.1%	20 New and Used Vehicle Preparation		<u>Graphic Arts Program</u>
.1%	21 Service Station Mechanic and Operator	1.0%	49 Two Year Associate Degree
.2%	22 Sport and Speciality Engine Mechanics	.3%	50 Nine Month Certificate
.6%	23 Tune-Up and Air Conditioning Specialist		<u>Horticulture Program</u>
.1%	24 <u>Automotive Parts Technology</u>		
.2%	25 <u>Banking and Finance Program</u>	.3%	51 Floriculture
		.7%	52 General Horticulture
	<u>Business Program</u>	.4%	53 Landscape Development
7.1%	26 Accounting	.1%	54 Nursery Management
2.7%	27 Bookkeeping	.1%	55 Turfgrass & Recreational Grounds Management
8.4%	28 Business Management Option		<u>Hospitality Program</u>
4.1%	29 Computer Programming Technology		
1.1%	30 Merchandising Management	.1%	56 Food Service
		.4%	57 Food Service Management
		1.0%	58 Hotel/Restaurant Management

Total

1.8%	59	<u>Interior Design Assistant</u>
1.2%	60	<u>Interpreter for the Hearing Impaired</u>
.7%	61	<u>Key Punch</u>
-	62	<u>Laboratory Animal Technology</u>
-	63	<u>Nurse Assistant</u>

Ophthalmic

-	64	Ophthalmic Laboratory Techniques
.4%	65	Ophthalmic Prescription Technician
.4%	66	Ophthalmic Technology

Photography Program

2.5%	67	Commercial Photography
.2%	68	<u>Practical Nursing</u>

Private Security Program

.2%	69	Private Security
3.2%	70	Private Security Management

Total

.9%	71	<u>Respiratory Therapy Technician</u>
-	72	<u>Retailing Program</u>
		<u>Secretarial Science Program</u>
1.6%	73	Clerk Typist
2.5%	74	Executive Secretary
3.4%	75	General Office Clerical
2.0%	76	Legal Secretary
1.0%	77	Medical Secretary

Surgical Technology Program

		<u>Welding Technology Program</u>
4.9%	79	Welding and Fabrication Technology
2.4%	80	Welding Technology

Youth Services Specialist Program

32. Metropolitan Technical Community College is considering a number of new programs. **If you were just beginning your education at Metro, which one of these programs would interest you most?** Mark your choice in Section 3 on the back of the page, adding the number at the top of the column.

9.1%	101	Diesel mechanics	2.1%	400	<u>Electronics</u>
5.6%	102	Sport & specialty engine mechanics (including small engine repair)	4.8%	401	Electro-mechanical technology
			2.4%	402	Instrumentation
3.0%	200	<u>Construction technologies</u>	.8%	500	<u>Dental program</u>
1.3%	201	Brick & block layers	1.6%	501	Dental lab technician
6.9%	202	Carpenter (including framing & finishing)	2.1%	502	Dental hygiene
.3%	203	Cement workers	7.0%	601	Medical office & record assistant
.5%	204	Drywall installer - finisher	2.1%	602	Nursing assistant
4.3%	205	Electrician	1.5%	603	Bio-medical technician
2.3%	206	Heavy equipment operator	1.8%	604	EEG (electro-encephalogram) and EKG (electro-cardiogram) technicians
1.6%	207	Iron workers	3.4%	605	Medical lab technician
.6%	208	Operating engineer	2.1%	606	Surgical technology assistant
2.1%	209	Plumbers & pipe fitters	2.7%	607	X-ray technician
1.0%	210	Sheet metal workers			
8.3%	301	Veterinarian assistant	5.9%	701	Media production specialist
3.8%	302	Machinery technology (including machinist, machine tool operator, tool & die worker)	8.7%	702	Human services technician



Southwest campus students please mark your answer to this question in Section 1 on the back of the answer sheet; please also write the number of your choice at the head of that column.

	<u>SW</u>
33. When the Southwest campus shifts from 132nd Street and I to 204th Street and Dodge, I will :	
1. not be effected because I will have completed my program.	8%
2. attend the new Elkhorn Valley campus at 204th and Dodge.	61%
3. transfer to the Ft. Omaha campus.	3%
4. transfer to the South Omaha campus.	11%
5. transfer to another school.	9%
6. not attend any school.	7%